# THE EXPOSITORY TIMES

## Notes of Recent Exposition

It is profoundly, and sometimes tragically, true that one half of the world does not know how the other half lives. It is still more fatally true that one half of the world does not know, far less understand, how the other half thinks. That is why the problem of communication is both an eternal problem and a problem which demands a new solution in every age. The Rev. Dean of Liverpool has faced up to this problem in *Christianity and Communication*.[1]

The problem is far from being simply a religious or a theological problem. It exists in the *industrial* world. The factory worker, for instance, seems unable to grasp the elementary economic truths which the management is so anxious to convey to him. It exists in the *political* world. At Lake success speeches can be so broadcast to the assembly that they are simultaneously heard by the delegates each in his own tongue, but that is far from saying that the ideas in them are understood or assimilated. It is true in the world of *business* and of *advertising*. In that world it is the notable conclusion of the experts that 'Only with trust can there be any real communication.' Communication is impossible unless the person speaking and the person listening trust each other. This problem cannot be left unsolved because 'when communication ceases, hatred and destruction are never far away.'

In one sense never was the stage better set for communication than it is to-day. There is almost a new industrial revolution going on at present. Mr. Dillistone speaks of 'the new direction of technology towards efficiency of communication rather than towards efficiency of production.' The aeroplane and the radio are essentially means of communication. This is still truer of television, which has been described as 'probably the most important influence on the human mind since the invention of printing.' And yet this very situation has its dangers. There can be such a thing as 'communications-fatigue.' People may be so bombarded with communications even in their own homes that they reach a state where they are either at the mercy of every successive attack, or are stunned into an impassive numbness which is unable to respond to any external stimulus at all.

There are two great means of communication—the word and the image; these correspond to the appeal to the ear and the appeal to the eye. Christianity has to use both word and image. The history of Christianity has to be told, so that the ear can hear it, by means of the word. Every civilization and every thought world has a *myth*, a world-picture expressed in some kind of intelligible terms, and the Christian world-picture has to be presented. The task of Christian communication must be to put Christianity, or rather to put Christ, at the centre of history and at the centre of the world-picture. Jesus Christ has to be communicated, not only as the fulfilment of Israel's history, but as the fulfilment of *all* history; and not only as the fulfilment but the *transformation* of it in the very act of fulfilment. Jesus Christ has to be put at the centre of the myth, the world-picture. That is exactly what the early preachers and writers did. To their own environment they said: 'He is the Logos; in Him is eternal life. He brings heaven to earth, He lifts earth to heaven. He is the High Priest of the whole created order: He is the source from which all things take their origin.' Christ has to become the centre of every world-picture. When Christ becomes the centre of every world-picture, and when He is seen as the fulfilment and the

[1] Collins; 12s. 6d. net.

transformation of all history, what great truth emerges ? It then becomes plain that the ' universe is to be interpreted in terms of *personal* values.' ' The ultimate structure of the universe is the expression of *personal* creativeness, the sustaining energy of the universe is sustained by *personal* outpouring, the goal of the universe is *personal* self-fulfilment.' Not the machine, but the *person*, is the most important entity in the universe.

How, then, can communication transcend different cultures and histories and backgrounds and environments ? The missionary must do two things. Simone Weil wrote : ' The art of transposing truths is one of the most essential and the least known. What makes it difficult is that, in order to practise it, one has to have placed oneself at the centre of a truth and possessed it in all its nakedness, behind the particular form in which it happens to have found expression.' And, further, not only must the communicator place himself at the heart of the truth, he must also, as Gabriel Marcel said that the dramatist must do, ' place himself at the heart of the human reality, in all its poignancy and intimacy. He must, it seems to me, link himself magnetically to the strands of our most secret agonies and our most secret hopes.' The missionary must enter into the heart of truth, *and* the heart of men.

Are there any key words, then, for this supremely difficult task of communication ? Dr. DILLISTONE suggests two. The first was coined by F. A. Cockin, the Bishop of Bristol. It is *imaginative identification*. Communication demands an imaginative identification with the person with whom we wish to communicate. The second is *reciprocal interchange*. Communication can never be a one-way process. As Mr. W. J. Bradnock has written : ' The missionary learns not only that the Christian believer has an inescapable responsibility to give the word to others, but that he must be prepared to receive new light and insight into its deepest meanings as it takes root in the hearts of his people and flowers forth in new cultural settings.'

*Imaginative self-identification, reciprocal interchange*—are these not precisely the principles which God Himself used in His Incarnation in Jesus Christ ?

Dr. DILLISTONE has not written an easy book ; his book is so close-packed and so economical of words that any summary of it must fail to do its logical, close-reasoned and incisive thinking justice; but he certainly has written a book which every one who is engaged on any kind of communication and especially Christian communication, has a plain duty to read.

---

Scientists who are both outstanding in their chosen field and also notable as Christian thinkers are not numerous, but Professor C. A. COULSON of Oxford is indubitably one of them. It is therefore with keen anticipation that one approaches a lecture of his on ' Nuclear Knowledge and Christian Responsibility ' published in the January issue of *The London Quarterly and Holborn Review*.

The tone of the lecture may be judged from a quotation which the lecturer makes from the late Dylan Thomas, the Welsh poet : ' Oh, isn't life a terrible thing, thank God ? ' A terrible thing it is, and that not only because nuclear knowledge has put it within the power of man to obliterate civilization and perhaps human life itself from the face of the earth. Short of that there are the genetical dangers associated with atomic explosions. Some damage of this sort is likely soon to become apparent, but the maximum effect due to explosions that have already occurred will not, say the experts, be experienced until something like the tenth generation. There are, moreover, aspects of contemporary life which are terrible enough quite apart from the destructive uses of atomic energy. The under-developed countries are no longer content with a standard of life much below that of the West, and at the same time the population of the world is believed to be increasing at the rate of about eighty thousand every day, and that chiefly in the places where food and health and civilization are at their lowest. Further, the world's supplies of such sources of energy as coal and oil are rapidly diminishing. Where, then, may we look for energy to meet the world's ever increasing needs ? The answer may be given in the words of Professor Bhabha, President of the United Nations conference for the peaceful uses of atomic energy. ' For the full industrialization of underdeveloped countries, for the continuance of our civilization and its further development, atomic energy is not merely an aid ; it is an absolute necessity.'

If we may take it for granted that it is God's will for His children everywhere that they should enjoy the benefits of civilization, then we are committed not only to a rapid development of the peaceful, as opposed to the destructive, uses of atomic energy, but also to a fair and reasonable distribution of that energy the world over. Nuclear knowledge, in short, makes life terrible, if wrongly used ; and

yet nuclear knowledge is something for which to hank God, for if rightly used it offers the hope ıot only of avoiding the irreparable genetic damage rvolved in its wrong use, but of taking away from he race the terrors of starvation and of opening up he possibility of a high civilization for all mankind. ٧o wonder Professor COULSON can say of the roblems involved here that ' dealing with them is oing to make life for our children immensely rilling—full of glorious opportunities and of ourse at the same time magnificent dangers.'

More important, however, is his considered judgent that the responsibilities connected with our ıclear knowledge are deeply religious. For one hing there are certain questions, not of a purely ientific character, which must be answered before ve can know how to use our scientific knowledge roperly. Among the most important of these is he question ' What is man ? ' The answer to that uestion is one of the greatest contributions that hristians can make to the world of the future. or his own part the distinguished lecturer conesses his belief that the revelation of God in Jesus hrist and among His saints is the only sure guide. nly in the light of that revelation do we see the rue nature of man as a child of God and begin to ee how to deal with the ethical problems raised by cience. Moreover, man's relation to the material orld indicates that there are religious implications f our nuclear knowledge. ' The earth is the Lord's nd the fullness thereof.' The order of Nature herefore carries meaning, and there is real truth n the suggestion that God will not be fully known ntil He is found in a developed knowledge of the niverse in which we live. Hence Professor OULSON wishes to see the field of nuclear energy laimed for Christ, in the sense of a recognition nat God's purposes of a full life for His children annot be fulfilled without it, and that in the earch and discovery some new facets of God's haracter and being will be revealed.

What, then, are the lecturer's suggestions ? irst, that the Christian Church should publicly ondemn all use of large-scale bomb explosions, ot because that is the way to peace—in present ircumstances it may or may not be that—but ecause it is an offence against the children of God. ext, that we should intensify our sharing of the ower provided by the peaceful uses of nuclear knowledge and avoid the unseemly rush, which has already started, to buy up all available resources of uranium. In this connexion we should remember that nuclear knowledge is a gift of God and that we owe it more immediately to the combined work of many people of different nationalities. Further, we should dream great dreams of a crusade to provide energy for the less developed regions of the earth—for example, the use of atomic power to evaporate sea water and transport it to irrigate the arid areas. Let the United Nations discuss where atomic stations should be built and call the peoples of the world to projects on a world scale, which would do more to establish good relations than interminable argument about the control of fissile material. Enterprises of great range, too, might be undertaken in the biological sphere, for the mutations produced by nuclear explosions, which are of such dire concern as regards human genes, can be of great advantage in agriculture for introducing new varieties of crops. We may well look forward to the time when we shall harvest crops beyond the Arctic circle and so cope with the rising world population's demand for food. Again, think of the possibilities opened up by nuclear knowledge for the curing of disease and the enhanced health of God's children in parts of the world where health is poor and disease is rampant.

In the light of such amazing possibilities one can be grateful for our nuclear knowledge, recognizing that it is not the fruit of some forbidden tree whose mortal taste must bring death and destruction to the world. Yet the terrible dangers are always there, so much so that there are those who urge that all nuclear research and development should be arrested. Professor COULSON is sure that such a policy would not only be impossible in this age, but would be a grievous sin. We have got to learn to live with the danger and the hope in nuclear knowledge. Not only so, but to us the call comes as to the children of Israel of old, ' Go ye in and possess the land,' for, says Professor COULSON, ' He gave us this land, just as surely as He gave the land of Canaan to those early wanderers ; and if we are brave enough and sensible and clear-minded enough to interpret His will in our new circumstances, we may discover that this Promised Land is rich with joy and fulfilment for all mankind. Only in that spirit can we hope to avoid the dangers and the temptation to unworthy ends.'

# 'Outward' and 'Inward' in Biblical Thought

By the Reverend A. W. Argyle, M.A., B.D., Oxford

F. Gavin in his book *The Jewish Antecedents of the Christian Sacraments* [1928], 7, declares that the distinction between the 'outward and visible' and the 'inward and spiritual' is characteristically non-Jewish and derived from a dualistic ideology. This statement implies that Jewish thought did not distinguish between 'outward' and 'inward' in human behaviour. In view of the use which is made of this statement in current discussions concerning the sacraments it is especially necessary to examine it closely. What are the facts?

First, it must be readily conceded that Hebrew thought is not dualistic in the sense in which Greek thought is dualistic. The Greek philosophers of Orphism and Pythagoreanism not merely distinguished between 'the outward and visible' and the 'inward and spiritual,' but set them in radical opposition to one another, holding that the material and physical is *per se* evil and the enemy of the spirit. They held that the human soul had a heavenly origin and, as a punishment for sin in the heavenly pre-existence, became incarcerated or entombed in the physical body which they regarded, like all matter, as intrinsically evil. At physical death the soul was released from the body in which throughout its earthly life it had been fettered as in a prison or a tomb. Hence the famous Orphic pun σῶμα σῆμα ('the body a tomb') which Plato quoted more than once,[1] though it is doubtful how far he identified himself with the Orphic position[2]; for, unlike his Neoplatonic successors, he did not stigmatize the body as evil, nor did he regard matter as the source of evil.[3]

Hebrew thought, unlike the Greek, did not set the outward and physical in sharp opposition to the inward and spiritual. On the contrary, it regarded man as a psycho-physical unity, a body animated by spirit. Thought, emotion, desire, will, were conceived to be psycho-physical activities seated in the physical organs of heart, liver, kidneys, bowels, and so on.[4] But it does not follow from this that the Hebrews drew no distinction between outward and inward in human personality and conduct. A careful reading of the Bible will show that this distinction is emphasized again and again both in the Old Testament and in the New.

[1] *Gorgias*, 493 A; *Cratylus*, 400 B.

[2] In the *Phaedo*, 62 C, he refuses to commit himself entirely to the Orphic dogma that while we are in the body we are undergoing penal servitude for ante-natal sin.

[3] Cf. A. E. Taylor, *Plato, the Man and his Work* [4] [1937], 455 n. 2, 492.

[4] See H. Wheeler Robinson, *The Christian Doctrine of Man* [1911], 20 ff.

## I

Let us examine first the Old Testament. Here the distinction between outward and inward operates in three forms: (1) the distinction between outward appearance and inward character; (2) that between outward acts and inward, spiritual motives; (3) that between physical disease and moral evil.

(1) The clearest instance of the first kind of distinction is found in 1 S $16^7$: 'man looketh on the outward appearance, but the Lord looketh on the heart.' There could hardly be a more succint expression of the distinction between 'the outward and visible' and the 'inward and spiritual.' It is not, of course, a distinction of the Greek kind. It does not imply any radical opposition between body and soul, for 'heart' is used here in the characteristic Hebrew way to mean the physical organ as well as its psychical life. But it is the psychical, spiritual life, the character of man, that is principally meant, and the dictum would not have been invalidated for the Hebrew mind if Eliab had been stretched on a modern operating table with his heart exposed to the surgeon's view. What the saying means is that whereas man judges another by the outward form of his body, God sees beyond this to the man's inner spiritual character and judges him by that. It would be impossible in the light of such a pronouncement to maintain that for the Jew the distinction between 'the outward and visible' and the 'inward and spiritual' was meaningless.

(2) It is but a short step to the second kind of distinction, that between outward acts and inward, spiritual motives. In Gn $4^{3f.}$ we read that Cain and Abel both offered a sacrifice, the former of the fruit of the ground, the latter of the firstlings of his flock, but apart from this there was outwardly no difference between the two acts of sacrifice. Yet God pronounced Abel to have done well and to have offered an acceptable sacrifice, but Cain to have done badly and

nacceptably, because 'sin coucheth at the door.' R. Driver in his Commentary writes: 'Why ere the two offerings regarded thus differently, hen each is described in similar language, and ch is manifestly intended as an expression of verence and thankfulness? . . . It can hardly ve lain in anything except the different spirit d temper actuating the two brothers.' Here a clear distinction between outward and inward th the implication that the latter is by far the ore significant.

The chief glory of the great ethical teaching of e old Testament prophets is their clear dis- mination between outward conformity to the remonial of the Law and righteousness of otive, holding that without the latter the rmer was of no avail. 'Yea, though ye offer e your burnt offerings and meat offerings, I ill not accept them: neither will I regard the ace offerings of your fat beasts. . . . But let dgement roll down as waters, and righteousness a mighty stream' (Am $5^{22.\ 24}$). 'Will the Lord e pleased with thousands of rams, or with ten ousands of rivers of oil? shall I give my first rn for my transgression, the fruit of my body r the sin of my soul? He hath shewed thee, O an, what is good; and what doth the Lord quire of thee, but to do justly, and to love ercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?' Mic $6^{7-8}$). 'For I desire mercy, and not sacrifice; nd the knowledge of God more than burnt fferings' (Hos $6^{6}$).[1] We may compare the words the Psalmist:

Create in me a clean heart, O God;
And renew a right spirit within me. . . .
For thou delightest not in sacrifice; else would
I give it:
Thou hast no pleasure in burnt offering.
The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit:
A broken and a contrite heart, O God, thou
wilt not despise.

(Ps $51^{10.\ 16-17}$).

Jeremiah, addressing adult Jews who had long go received outward physical circumcision, xpressly distinguishes between that circumcision the flesh, which he plainly regards as having en morally ineffectual, and the inward circum- sion of repentance and spiritual cleansing of hich they stood in dire need (Jer $4^{4}$; cf. $9^{25-26}$). utward circumcision of the flesh was the work of ie Old Covenant written outwardly on tables of one. The New Covenant, an inward, spiritual ovenant of Divine salvation and forgiveness, quires something deeper, more inward, more dividual, more personal, a change of heart er $31^{31f.}$). A similar thought is expressed in Deuteronomy: 'The Lord thy God will circumcise thine heart, and the heart of thy seed, to love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, that thou mayest live' (Dt $30^{6}$; cf. $10^{16}$).

(3) Although it may be true that the primitive rites for purification in the Priest's Code 'originated in a time when no clear distinction was made between "uncleanness" (infringement of a taboo), disease, and moral wrong,'[2] nevertheless the distinction between physical disease and sin was clearly achieved as Hebrew thought developed. It is obvious from the description of several kings in the historical books of the Old Testament that sickness and death were neither equated with, nor regarded as necessarily due to, sin; for even the kings who 'did that which was right in the eyes of the Lord' fell sick and died. For instance, Asa was diseased in his feet (1 K $15^{23}$), yet he is one of the kings who are thus highly commended ($15^{11.\ 14}$). There is no blurring here of the distinction between physical disease and moral wrong. And, although the prophets often speak of suffering as a punishment for sin, they do not regard all suffering as punitive. The Suffering Servant of Deutero-Isaiah was a righteous servant (Is $53^{9.\ 11}$).

From the Book of Job it is clear that some Jews, even if they did not identify sin and physical disease, at least took the view that physical disease must be the evidence and consequence of sin. But the purpose of the author of Job is expressly to refute this idea. There is not a nobler protest in all literature against a crass materialism which would regard prosperity and health as necessarily the reward or accompaniment of righteousness, and misfortune and suffering as necessarily the result of sin. Nor is the disinterested integrity of the pure motive of true, inward, spiritual religion anywhere more movingly portrayed, nor the distinction between mere outward rightness, dependent upon favourable circumstances, and inward goodness of sincere love for God, which endures in spite of suffering and loss, anywhere more firmly grasped.

## II

In the New Testament the distinction between outward and inward in human personality becomes even more emphatic and important, and its origins lie in the Old Testament, not in Greek thought. In a key passage (Mk $7^{1-23}$) Jesus quotes in reference to the scribes and Pharisees and their scrupulous attention to such outward rites as ceremonial washings, the words of Is $29^{13}$ (LXX):

[1] Cf. Mt $9^{13}$ $12^{7}$.

[2] G. F. Moore, *History of Religion*, ii. [1919], 42–43; cited by F. Gavin, *loc. cit.*

'This people honoureth me with their lips, but their heart is far from me. In vain do they worship me, teaching as their doctrines the precepts of men' (Mk $7^{6-7}$). Later in the same passage He contrasts what goes into a man from without and cannot defile him, with that which proceeds from within a man and does defile him (Mk $7^{18-23}$). The distinction between the relatively unimportant outward acts of eating, drinking and washing, on the one hand, and the vitally important acts of will, desires and emotions, on the other, could not be more forcibly expressed. That it is more important for man to cleanse his inner nature than his outward body is symbolically asserted also in the saying, addressed to the Pharisee, which contrasts the inside and the outside of the cup. 'Cleanse first the inside of the cup . . . that the outside thereof may become clean also' (Mt $23^{26}$; cf. Lk $11^{39f.}$).

In the Sermon on the Mount Jesus stresses the importance of inward motive, condemning anger no less than murder, lust no less than adultery (Mt $5^{21f.}$). He requires not mere outward cleanness, but purity of heart ($5^{8}$) and saintly humility of spirit ($5^{3}$). He denounces the hypocrites who love to make an open show of prayer, almsgiving and righteousness ($6^{1f.}$); and false prophets who come in sheep's clothing (that is, appearing outwardly innocent), but inwardly are ravening wolves ($7^{15}$); and scribes and Pharisees who are like unto whited sepulchres, which outwardly appear beautiful, but inwardly are full of dead men's bones and of all uncleanness, for they also outwardly appear righteous unto men, but inwardly are full of hypocrisy and iniquity ($23^{27f.}$).

In the Fourth Gospel (Jn $9^{3}$) Jesus expressly repudiates the notion that outward physical disease was necessarily the consequence or concomitant of inward moral evil or sin. In regard to a man blind from birth the disciples ask Jesus: 'Rabbi, who did sin, this man or his parents, that he should be born blind?' Jesus answered: 'Neither did this man sin, nor his parents' The meaning of the reply is not, of course, that the man and his parents were sinless, but that the blindness of the man was no consequence of any sin that either he or his parents had committed. Jesus, like the author of Job, was discrediting the doctrine that there must necessarily be a connection between outward physical disease and inward moral evil.

The distinction between outward and inward is equally prominent in the letters of St. Paul. In Ro $2^{28-29}$ he writes (in words reminiscent of Jer $4^{4}$ and Dt $10^{16}$ $30^{6}$): 'he is not a Jew, which is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision, which is outward in the flesh: but he is a Jew, which is one inwardly; and circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter whose praise is not of men, but of God' (cf. Jn $1^{47}$). Like Jeremiah, Paul is insisting that the true circumcision is not an outward rite, but an inward, spiritual, change of heart. In 2 Co $4^{16}$ he contrasts the corruptibility of his outward physical nature with the daily renewal of his inner spiritual nature: 'though our outward man is decaying, yet our inward man is renewed day by day.' Here, as also at Ro $7^{22}$, Paul contrasts the physical body, the outward man, with mind and spirit, the inner man (cf. Eph $3^{16}$).

Paul explicitly applies this distinction between outward and inward in his discussion of the sacraments of baptism and the eucharist in 1 Co 10. Taking the passage of the Jews under the cloud and through the sea in the Exodus as a type, or counterpart, of baptism, and the eating of the manna and drinking from the rock as a type, or counterpart, of the eucharist, he observes that not all of those who were thus outwardly baptized and fed were inwardly cleansed and saved, for 'with most of them God was not well pleased: for they were overthrown in the wilderness' ($10^{5}$). Here is an emphatic warning that the outward sacramental rites have no *ex opere operato* efficacy, but are only efficacious if those who receive them have inward sincerity, penitence and faith.

In Col $2^{11}$ Christian baptism is described as 'a circumcision not made with hands.' Here a twofold distinction is implied: (a) between outward and inward circumcision, like that of Ro $2^{28-29}$ and the parallel passages in the Old Testament; (b) between baptism regarded as a physical rite, in which the use of hands was prominent (as it was also in physical circumcision), and inward baptism, spiritual regeneration, which is made without hands, and which is infinitely more important than the outward rite considered by itself. This inward spiritual baptism is a laying aside of the fleshly nature, that is, frail human nature as corrupted by sin; it is a baptism accomplished by Christ Himself, with whom we are buried in baptism and raised again in newness of life by faith-union with God who raised Him from the dead (Col $2^{12}$).

The inwardness of true baptism, as distinguished from mere outward washing, is forcibly maintained also in 1 P $3^{21}$. After treating as a type of baptism the salvation of Noah and his family in the Flood by an Ark, the writer goes on to define Christian baptism as 'not the putting off of filth of the flesh, but a pledge (ἐπερώτημα)[1] towards God arising from a good conscience.' This means that the important thing in baptism

[1] On this term see E. G. Selwyn, *The First Epistle of St. Peter* [1947], 205.

not the outward rite alone but the penitent
lever's inward moral desire for the good life,
e resurrection life of Christ bestowed by the
irit of God who raised Jesus from the dead.
nilarly in He $10^{19-22}$ ' it is emphasized that the
tual bathing of the body in water represents a
rification that goes far beyond the physical.
e outward washing of the body typifies the
ward cleansing of the soul, a cleansing made
ssible because of the sacrificial death of
rist.' [1]

So far, therefore, from being foreign to Biblical
ought, the distinction between ' outward and

[1] W. F. Flemington, *The New Testament Doctrine of Baptism* [1948], 98.

visible ' and ' inward and spiritual ' is fundamental to the highest teaching of the Bible. It is central to the message of the greatest Old Testament prophets, psalmists, and writers of wisdom literature, and it reaches its consummation in the gospel of Christ and the proclamation of the New Testament Church. The greatest figures both of the Old Testament and of the New deplore the insincerity of a merely outward religion, ' holding a form of godliness, but having denied the power thereof ' (2 Ti $3^5$). Repeated emphasis is laid upon the greater significance of the ' inward ' than of the ' outward,' and in the New Testament this important distinction is applied specifically to the Christian sacraments.

# Literature

### *I and II THESSALONIANS*

n admirable commentary has been contributed
' The Tyndale New Testament Commentaries,'
ited by Professor R. V. G. Tasker in *The Epistles Paul to the Thessalonians* (Tyndale Press ; 7s. 6d.
t), by the Rev. Leon Morris, B.Sc., M.Th., Ph.D.,
ce-Principal of Ridley College, Melbourne.

A notable feature of the commentary is its adability, a characteristic rarely found in the merous short works of the kind which at the oment appear to be so much in demand. Dr. orris has the gift of expressing himself with great cidity, even when treating the meaning of words d points of grammatical construction, and pecially when he comments upon the teaching of e two Epistles. Indeed, one could wish that he d written a full scale commentary on the Greek xt rather than that of the Authorized Version ed in this series because it is said to be the version nich most Bible readers possess, and because using it commentators can show more easily ny the later versions are so often to be preferred.

The Introduction to the commentary is of much terest, especially the treatment of the order in nich the two Epistles were written. It is useful have the other side presented to the attractive pothesis of Johannes Weiss, supported by T. W. anson, that 2 Thessalonians was written first. mong many valuable discussions in the comentary the detailed examination of the apocaptic section in 2 Th $2^{1-12}$ stands out. Dr. Morris scusses the different interpretations of the entity of ' the Man of Lawlessness,' and his eatment is none the less welcome because he aves the question open. ' The plain fact is,' he ites, ' that we do not know, and it seems best nestly to admit the fact, and not to try to force the passage into conformity with some particular theory which has been evolved on the basis of imperfect knowledge.'

This commentary is worthy to stand side by side with those of Milligan, Frame, Findlay, and Neil, even though it is written to a smaller scale. It provokes the reader to study the Epistles further for the light they throw on Paul the missionary and pastor and on the great Pauline doctrines which are present, as Dr. Morris says, ' either by implication or direct mention.'

VINCENT TAYLOR

---

### *CONFLICT OF RELIGIONS*

While some people feel that attempts to bring together the followers of different religions are hopeless, as they could be expected to produce nothing more than a kind of lowest common multiple which would leave little of any significance, others hold that by mutual discussion, and even by common worship, a deeper understanding can be attained and a certain amount of unity can be achieved. Dr. Philip H. Ashby is among this latter group, and in his book *The Conflict of Religions* (Scribners' ; 21s. net) he argues his case with great sincerity. He writes for the intelligent layman rather than for the scholar, but expresses the hope that his book will have the scholar's approval.

The religions with which he deals are Christianity, Islam, Hinduism, and Buddhism, the first two representing religion in the West and the others religion in the East. He first deals with each religion separately under the headings of the encounter with the present, the internal tensions, and the variety of thought, then discusses their presuppositions regarding religious knowledge,

their views on the Divine, on man, and on human fulfilment, and their theories of reconciliation. This occupies the main part of the book and is very well done. In dealing with such large questions in the limited space at his disposal he has given a very clear account of the characteristic teachings. Here and there one may feel that he makes general statements which require qualification, but his purpose is to give an outline of some main teachings of the religions and not to present a systematic treatise.

Having described the main doctrines, he discusses in the last chapter how the religions can live together. He has discussed the conflicts between the religions and within each religion; now he looks forward to a stage beyond conflict. While he is a strong advocate of co-operation between the religions, he recognizes that co-operation without compromise is the most one can hope for at the present stage. He argues that 'if the separate religions cannot themselves come to see the related nature and the extreme value of their knowledge of the Divine, Man, and Human Fulfilment, they cannot expect the modern man to be greatly concerned with it.' He admits that the different theories of the Divine discussed in the earlier part of the book cannot all be lumped together into a unity without doing violence to the conviction of each, but he holds that something must be done to meet the prevalent sense of frustration in the modern world. While each religion claims to possess power to lift man out of his despair, 'it suffers from a delusion as tragic as that of man if it does not perceive that alone it can accomplish little, while in a united witness with the other religions on those fundamentals which are essential to all, and which are desperately needed by contemporary man, it can accomplish much.' He therefore proposes that the religions should get together by exchange of thought, some degree of common worship and spiritual fellowship, the proclamation of a religious ethical standard, and co-operation in freedom which will not insist on uniformity. It is a programme which may seem a little idealistic, but few would disagree that there should be an exchange of thought. That is indeed being done by different groups and is meeting with some, if not complete, success. This book presents an interesting thesis which deserves serious consideration.

JAMES ROBSON

---

## *AMOS, HOSEA AND MICAH*

The general title of the series to which *Amos, Hosea and Micah*, by Principal Norman H. Snaith, D.D. (Epworth Press; 9s. 6d. net) belongs—'Epworth Preacher's Commentaries'—gives the clue to what is to be found in it. It is not concerned with questions of date, authorship and composition, and allocates little space to them; it concentrates upon the content and the perennial value of the books of the Bible to give aid to preachers. Principal Snaith does say of Hos 3 that, whereas some scholars regard it as authentic and as having reference to Gomer redeemed from slavery, he considers it to be an allegory based upon the details of Hosea's life and written by an author of later date than Hosea. Of Mic 4–7 he says that most of the disputed material in them belongs roughly to the same period as Micah. But such questions apart, Principal Snaith devotes himself to exegesis and exposition. He deals with the Books of Amos, Hosea and Micah section by section, gives succinct comments upon the text and upon any problems of interpretation which arise, and pays particular attention to the explication of the prophetic message in terms of its continuing relevance and with reference to its fulfilment in the Christian gospel. He has a gift of popular exposition, in which he can be scholarly without being burdensome and particular without being pedantic. A notable preacher himself, he can discern the points in a passage which a preacher may use as the pivotal points of a sermon. If all the volumes in the series serve the purpose in view as well as this one, they will find a place on the shelves of many manse studies and will not gather dust there as other more pretentious volumes sometimes do.

JOHN MAUCHLINE

---

## *RELIGION AND PSYCHIATRY*

*Christian Essays in Psychiatry*, ed. by Philip Mairet (S.C.M.; 15s. net), is to be welcomed if only for the fact that there is a real acknowledgment from the psychiatrists' side of the contribution which religion, theology, and the clergy can make to the growing problem of functional nervous disorders and psycho-somatic disturbances. The purpose of the volume is to integrate religion and psychiatry. There has been for long a demand for this from the religious side. There is, for instance, the late Archbishop Temple's Committee for Clergy and Doctors and we have the Guild of Pastoral Psychology. Individual doctors, such as Hadfield and Dr. William Brown, have done good work here; this is the first volume from doctors with the avowed intention of linking psychiatry and pastoral psychology together.

The volume contains a strong Jungian bias. There is an assumption that Jung is more favourable to religion than Freud. But we should not forget that Erich Fromm has shown that, whereas *Freud as against Jung spoke in the name of the*

*ethical core of religion, Jung reduced religion to a psychological phenomenon and elevated the unconscious to a religious phenomenon.* Jung is interested in religion only as a functional necessity.

Apart from the Jungian bias the writers take no account of the deviationists nor the development within psycho-analysis itself. This, I think, should at least have been noted in such chapters as 'Current Concepts in Psychiatry,' and in the editor's chapter on 'Presuppositions of Psychological Analysis.' Outside of Freud, Adler, and Jung, we have Fromm and Ferenczi mentioned once, Maeder once for his illustration of the puppets. Kretschmer is mentioned in Dr. Strauss's chapter on the 'Constitutional Approach.' There is much in Fairbairn's *object-seeking* instead of Freud's *pleasure-seeking*, and Marjorie Brierley's implication of Christianity for Integrative Living in her 'Trends in Psycho-analysis,' to say nothing of Karen Horney, Sullivan, etc. in America, relevant to the purpose of this volume. Be that as it may, let us be satisfied and rejoice in what we have got. And we have got a good deal.

Dr. Stafford-Clark emphasizes that along with the need to love and be loved and other needs acknowledged by psychiatrists, *the need to believe* should be equally acknowledged. *Atonement, forgiveness, love, and redemption are an essential part of the divine answer to human predicament.*

Dr. Storr deals with the religious development of the individual and thinks 'it may be analogous to his sexual development.' By that he means that it may be possible to 'recognize immature forms of religious experience in childhood and adolescence and that the strands of immature experience might unite and issue in something which could be called a mature religious experience.' He believes the mature religious experience to be *the dearest thing a man may possess.* Miss Lewis, the educationist, out of her great experience with children, outlines the attitudes children take to religion. One interesting point in the attitude of the children of the middle years, from nine to twelve, is that when asked what person they would most wish to resemble they always voted for someone who had exercised power. Even those who chose Jesus did so because He worked miracles. Dr. Russell in 'Individual Treatment' gives illustrative cases, and, like Miss Lewis, gives much practical help to ministers. A needed restraint to the enthusiasm of the psychologists is Dr. Strauss's excellent chapter on 'The Constitutional Approach.' Probably the most helpful essay for the ministers and indeed for the psychiatrists who read this book is that of Father White, the author of 'God and the Unconscious.' He deals with 'Guilt, Psychological and Theological.' It is an excellent exposition not to be missed. His use of Jung's 'archetypes' to illustrate the source of some guilt is well done. He links his exposition with spiritual direction and gives maximum help to those who have to deal with souls burdened with guilt.

In spite of its obvious limitations this is a book to read and digest and at least it makes known that the relation between religion and psychiatry is a two-way-traffic.

J. G. McKenzie

---

## *ATHENAGORAS*

The twenty-third volume of the 'Ancient Christian Writers' series contains the two works of Athenagoras, *Embassy for the Christians*, and *The Resurrection of the Dead*, translated and annotated by Professor Joseph Hugh Crehan, S.J. (Longmans; 21s. net; standing orders at 18s.). Athenagoras is one of the most interesting of all the Christian apologists. Before he became a Christian he was a famous Platonist philosopher; he may well have been the Athenagoras to whom, as Photius relates, Boethus dedicated his book on 'Difficult Sentences in Plato.' According to Philip of Side Athenagoras was 'a man who professed Christianity while still wearing the philosopher's garb and was the leading man in the Academic School. Before Celsus he had planned to write against the Christians, but, reading the Holy Scriptures to make his attack the more telling, he was so won over by the Holy Spirit as to become, like the great Paul, a teacher, and not a persecutor, of the faith he was attacking.' It is, indeed, of the greatest interest to see this cultured Greek mind defend the Christian faith.

This defence of Christianity was made to the Emperors Marcus Aurelius and Commodus. The three main charges against which Christianity is defended are atheism, cannibalism, and promiscuity.

His book on the resurrection of the body is of the greatest interest; and still remains a notable defence of that doctrine. His most interesting defence of the resurrection of the body is that such a resurrection is only justice. Man is neither soul alone nor body alone. Both soul and body share in any action; and therefore it would be unjust that the soul alone should bear the ultimate penalties and rewards. So then Athenagoras argues that in simple justice the resurrection of the body is essential. As to its possibility, it is his argument that the God who can create must certainly be the God who can restore.

This volume amply maintains the high standard of the series of which it is a part. The introduction is clear and lucid, and the analysis of the two

works translated is specially helpful. The translation itself reads smoothly and easily. The notes are ample and learned.

This is certainly a volume in which both the technical scholar and the general reader will find much of interest.

WILLIAM BARCLAY

---

## *DR. MENZIES' SERMONS*

Great preaching is even rarer in writing than it is in speech, for the number of sermons which will stand the test of print is comparatively small. That is why we are grateful for *The Riches of His Grace*, by the Rev. Robert Menzies, D.D. (James Clarke ; 10s 6d. net).

All Dr. Menzies' preaching is Bible-centred, and he has a very special gift for making a text despatch him on a voyage of spiritual discovery. He has a sermon for a re-dedication service, entitled 'We Lose Him,' based on the story of the day when Jesus' parents lost Him and found Him again in the Temple. Dr. Menzies points out, how easy it is to lose Jesus, how the most unlikely people lose Him, how they lose Him in the most unlikely places. He speaks of the tragedy of losing Jesus ; and then he goes on to say that, if we lose Jesus, the surest way to find Him again is in humility, and often in shame, to retrace our steps to where we lost Him. 'In the cathedral of Copenhagen there is a statue of Christ chiselled by Thorwaldsen the Danish sculptor. As you approach it the face is hidden. Disappointed at first, the guide tells you to approach it upon your knees, and, as you do so, the face of Christ, looks down on you in great benignancy. We can only rediscover our lost Saviour when we retrace our steps, confess our sins, practise the disciplines of the Spirit, and put ourselves wholly in Christ's hands.'

Dr. Menzies has the gift for the apt illustration and quotation. 'One loving heart,' said Augustine, 'sets another on fire.' 'The Devil,' said Latimer, 'is the diligentest bishop in all the parish.' Lord Acton once said : 'Mastery is acquired by resolved limitation.' An old divine said : 'There was one malefactor on the Cross who repented, that none might despair, and only one, that none might presume.' Croce, the Italian philosopher said, 'Beauty is successful expression.'

Dr. Menzies tells of a lovely story from the experience of Carlyle. When he was a boy his father had to carry him by a narrow plank across a stream in full flood. He carried him face downwards so that he could see nothing but the raging waters. 'If it had been my mother who had carried me,' he said, 'she would have given me her face to look at.'

This is a book of the greatest value. It is a book in which sound scholarship, wide culture, evangelical passion are all lit up by the deep experience of a long ministry. The preacher will not only find sermons here ; he will also find good for his soul, as will every reader, preacher or not.

On p. 37 *Luke viii.–xiv.* should be *Luke viii.* 14 ; on p. 82 *uncoventionality* should be *unconventionality* ; on pp. 109 and 118 it should be noted that the New Testament spelling is *Nathanael*, not *Nathaniel*.

WILLIAM BARCLAY

---

## *JESUS' BELIEF IN MAN*

A book by the late Dr. Edwin McNeill Poteat—he died in 1955—has been published posthumously—*Jesus' Belief in Man* (Abingdon Press ; $2.50). One must pay tribute to the literary excellence of the work. It is extraordinarily readable, with its crisp, often almost epigrammatic, diction. The aim is to show that Jesus did not lend a basis to the Augustinian view of man's inherently corrupt nature. However man may—and does—rebel against God, there is something of God in his constitution. In rebellion against God man is rebelling against the best in himself. In pronouncing a verdict on human nature the pessimistic judgment must be avoided as well as the over-optimistic. The evangelist will preach in vain save on the assumption that there is something in the sinner to which appeal may be made and which may respond. Dr. Poteat cannot find in the records any trace of Jesus' belief in a doctrine of original sin. He blames St. Paul for exaggeration when he declares 'the good that I would I do not, the evil that I would not that I do.' Obviously the Apostle quite frequently did the good it was in his heart to do, as well as resisting temptation. It would be ridiculous to think otherwise.

By a careful, interesting, and suggestive study of the Temptations of Jesus, His short proverbial sayings, His parables of the Kingdom, the Golden Rule, His love of humanity, the author puts us greatly in his debt.

One might say that one side of Jesus' teaching is not sufficiently examined, most notably the text 'ye must be born again.'

Two minor mistakes strike one. One does not know on what authority Galileo is called the inventor of the microscope (p. 111). On p. 137, 'commented' should be 'commended.'

W. D. NIVEN

---

Not many devotional works issued a century ago are still in demand ; but we believe that

others, besides Methodists, will be interested to hear that *The Tongue of Fire, or The True Power of Christianity*, by William Arthur, has been edited and abridged by the Rev. John H. J. Barker and published at 10s. 6d. by the Epworth Press. First published in 1856, the book went through eighteen editions in three years and its message and challenge are still relevant to-day. Readers will be glad to learn something of the author from Mr. Barker's biographical note and introduction. On p. 122 line 7 for 'Holy Church' read 'Holy Ghost.'

---

Ten sermons, preached by the Reverend David N. Francis in St. George's Church, Bournemouth, have been published by the Epworth Press (*'But Above All . . .'*; 6s. net). Mr. Francis relates the perplexities of modern life to the great Christian truths, and we have much evidence of faith in God and sympathy with man. His style is clear, alive, and challenging. For the Christian Year section this month we have chosen the sermon on Hebrews $12^1$.

---

We must read with interest and respect anything which issues from the Society of Friends. *Sacraments : A Quaker Approach*, by Maurice A. Creasey (Friends' Home Service ; 4d.), is a little pamphlet setting out the Quaker view of the Sacraments. The Quaker point of view is that 'every part of the experience of those who are learning to interpret it in the light of this revelation may therefore become a channel whereby God's love and grace are revealed and communicated. In other words, every part of life may become, in this way, sacramental.' Three things are claimed. (1) The New Testament evidence is said to be by no means unequivocal. (2) It is claimed that, in any event, the New Testament evidence will not bear the weight of the structures of doctrine and practice erected upon it. (3) If the principle of development under the guidance of the Holy Spirit be claimed to justify the sacramental development of the churches, the Quakers may very well claim the same principle to justify their own practice. Every churchman would do well to read this book ; he may not agree with it—he probably will not—but it will certainly make him think.

*None Other Name*, by A. Frank Ward (Friends' Home Service ; 9d.), is the substance of an address given to the Friends' Home Service Committee in October, 1955. The writer believes in sharing religious experience. 'We shall continue to be subject to all kinds of weaknesses both moral and mental. Our doubtings from many causes will continue to arise. But we can tell each other, as I have tried to do, that we are living in a world where there seems to be a spiritual conspiracy to bring to each travelling soul flashes of insight, shades of meaning, encouragement to stand and strive again.' Differences there must be, but they need not trouble us. 'Our worshipping fellowships should be places and opportunities for discovery, where those who have discovered will make no rigid claims which override or attempt to regiment or standardize the minds and experiences of others. It will be found that those who have discovered most will be most aware of how much remains to be known, and their attitude will increasingly reflect to others the graciousness and understanding of their Lord to themselves.' That indeed is wisely spoken.

*Friends and Truth*, an essay by Richard K. Ullmann, with an introduction by Herbert G. Wood (Friends' Home Service ; 4s. 6d.) is a much more difficult book. Mr. Ullmann thinks that the modern expression of Quakerism too often shows 'under the mask of seekers, the uncertainty of doubters, but not the emphasis of finders.' He contrasts this with the first days of Quakerism, when men literally lived the life of the Kingdom. To seek to remedy this defect he turns to what Existentialism, and especially to what Karl Jaspers, has to say. This is a book by a man who obviously knows his subject ; and it will enable the reader to understand better, not only the Quakers, but also the Existentialists.

---

We commend *A Brief Dictionary of Quakerism*, written by Horace B. Pointing and published at 2s. 6d. by Friends' Home Service Committee. In one hundred and nine numbered paragraphs the origin, principles and structure of the Society of Friends are set forth, and an alphabetical table of contents makes reference easy.

---

*The Historical Trustworthiness of the Gospels* (Friends' Home Service ; 1s. net) consists of the text of an address given by Dr. G. H. Boobyer at the London Yearly Meeting in the Friends' House in London.

Dr. Boobyer sets out to answer two questions. One concerns the *text* of the New Testament. 'Do we possess a reliable version of what the gospel evangelists originally wrote ?' The other concerns the *contents* of the text. 'Is what the evangelists wrote a trustworthy account of the life and mission of Jesus ?'

Dr. Boobyer has no difficulty in giving an affirmative answer to these two questions. This book contains only twenty-three pages, but it is the work of real scholarship, and here we meet the views of C. H. Dodd, Austen Farrer, B. H. Streeter, R. Bultmann, and hear what is of permanent value in each. This book is an excellent summary of the subject with which it deals.

*Truly Called*, edited by the Rev. Douglas Webster, Home Education Secretary of the Church Missionary Society (Highway Press; 1s. 6d. net), consists of four papers on the subject of the training of men for the ministry of the Church overseas. The contributors are engaged in this work in Southern Sudan, Nigeria, Uganda and South India. There is much of value here, even for those who are not contemplating service with the C.M.S.

*Famous Life Decisions : Point of No Return*, by the Rev. Cecil Northcott (Independent Press; 1s. net), consists of six broadcasts, delivered in the 'Lift up your Hearts' series, and is one of the Broadcast Talks Series. This book tells of decisive moments in the lives of Frank Laubach, Albert Schweitzer, Reinhold van Thadden, Karl Barth, and Toyohiko Kagawa. It closes with Kagawa's great insistence: 'God dwells among the lowliest of men. He sits on the dust heap among the prison converts. He stands with the juvenile delinquents. He is there with the beggars. He is among the sick. He stands with the unemployed. Therefore let him who would meet God visit the prison cell before going to the temple. Before he goes to Church let him visit the hospital. Before he reads his Bible let him help the beggar.'

The Bishop of London's Lent book for 1957, by the Rev. Gordon Lewis Phillips (Longmans; 5s. 6d. net), takes the unusual form of an introduction to some early Christian writings and writers. The title is a phrase from Justin Martyr's account of his conversion—*Flame in the Mind*. The quotations are numerous and the presentation is fresh, and thus the book is calculated to stir the hearts of readers to a better appreciation of their Christian heritage.

*A Short Introduction to Moral Theology*, by the Rev. Lindsay Dewar, B.D., Hon. Canon of St. Albans (Mowbray; 3s. 6d. net), is a pamphlet of forty-eight pages containing three lectures delivered to clergy on what the author regards as 'most important' themes of moral theology. The first is on the place of Law in the Christian religion. It shows how unsatisfactory are three distinctions often drawn. (*a*) Christian morality is positive; Law is negative; (*b*) it is internal, Law is external; (*c*) it is based on principles, but knows nothing of Laws. The second is an excellent discussion of the Christian Doctrine of Conscience. The third is on Christian Casuistry. Casuistry, as the author allows, is a rather disreputable word, but it just means what we all have at times to do—endeavour to 'solve the problem of a doubtful conscience.' The discussion here is very helpful. For those who have not studied Moral Philosophy in a University or Christian Ethics in a Divinity curriculum the booklet will serve its purpose of showing the kind of problem with which, among many others, those disciplines deal.

*The Episcopal Chapel at Muchalls*, by the Rev. John Paul Hill (Mowbray; 16s. net), tells the story of a congregation composed of the people of two fishing villages between Stonehaven and Aberdeen who, without encouragement from any local magnate, remained faithful to the Scottish Episcopal Church throughout the period of the Jacobite risings and the subsequent years of the penal laws until the death of Charles Edward left the strictest Scottish Episcopalians free to transfer their allegiance to the Hanoverians. The story is well told; indeed, this is an admirable example of a congregational history which opens many side-lights on the social as well as on the ecclesiastical life of past generations.

In an appendix is printed an eighteenth century sermon illustrative of the eucharistic theology of the Scottish Nonjurors.

Those who would like to attend the three hours' devotion on Good Friday, but are prevented by illness or otherwise, will be glad to know of *Beneath the Cross*, by Dr. J. I. Brice (Mowbray; 4s. net). Besides meditations on the seven words from the Cross the author has indicated appropriate hymns and has provided brief Scripture readings and prayers. The meditations are fresh and illuminating.

*The Rules of the Game*, by Mr. Arnold S. Clark (National Sunday School Union; 1s. 3d. net), is a booklet of thirty-two pages which is sub-titled *A Handbook for Young Christians*. It is in the form of a series of letters to Tom and Mary, and it deals with such subjects as A Christian reads his Bible, A Christian prays, A Christian observes Sunday, A Christian goes to Church, A Christian listens to conscience, A Christian gives, A Christian serves, A Christian keeps life clean, A Christian flies his flag.

There is sound Christian advice in this book; nothing is shirked; matters like sex and gambling are sensibly treated. But the book has one fault, a fault which spoils too many books of this kind—it is too determinedly cheerful, and even facetious.

It is good to know that *The Reformed Pastor*, by Richard Baxter, has found a place in the 'Treasury of Christian Books,' published by the S.C.M. (8s. 6d. net). Baxter needs some editing to get rid of his repetitions, and Dr. Hugh Martin seems to have done this with judgment. Though three hundred years old this classic can still challenge and move the heart.

# Expository Problems

## The Ascension—Acts i. 9

By the Reverend Canon C. F. D. Moule, Lady Margaret's Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge

### The Text

Luke 24[44] 'Then (δέ) he said to them, "These are my words which I spoke to you. . . ." [49] "And behold, I send the promise of my Father upon you; but stay in the city, until you are clothed with power from on high." [50] Then (δέ) he led them out as far as Bethany, and lifting up his hands he blessed them. [51] While he blessed them, he parted from them [and was carried up into heaven].[1] [52] And they returned to Jerusalem with great joy, [53] and were continually in the temple blessing God.'

Acts 1[2] '. . . until the day when he was taken up, . . . [3] To them [the apostles] he presented himself alive . . . appearing to them during forty days, . . . [4] And while staying [or, eating] with them he charged them not to depart from Jerusalem, but to wait for the promise of the Father. . . . [5] ". . . before many days. . . ." [9] And when he had said this, as they were looking on, he was lifted up, and a cloud took him out of their sight. [10] And while they were gazing into heaven as he went, behold, two men stood by them in white robes, [11] and said, "Men of Galilee, why do you stand looking into heaven? This Jesus, who was taken up from you into heaven, will come in the same way as you saw him go into heaven."'

### The Problems

Few of the Christian festivals are so hard on the preacher as Ascensiontide. Many formidable questions rear their heads. For instance, what, doctrinally speaking, are we to make of a distinction between the Resurrection and the Ascension, and what is the meaning of the Ascension as a separate moment? Is the Ascension the vindication of Christ? But that has already been established by the Resurrection. Is it (as preachers sometimes say) His 'coronation'? But again—short of some creation-wide acclamation—no kingly crown could shine more brilliantly than that which the Resurrection had already placed on the head of Christ. That He was alive meant already that He had conquered. What more, then, is needed? Or again, in what sense, if any, can the Ascension be described as historical and what, in particular, are we to make of the forty days' interval between the Resurrection and the Ascension, alluded to in Ac 1[3] (cf. 13[31])? Is this fact or fiction?

### The Forty Days

This is far from the most important of the questions before us; but, since it is complex, it may as well be taken up at once. Only in Ac 1[3] is there any mention of forty days' interval.[2] All other references in the Gospels or Acts to an ascension or assumption[3] either must, or at least may, be taken as part and parcel of the Easter

[1] Om ℵ* D it (sy[sin] seems to compromise ['while he was blessing them, he was lifted from them']—see P. Benoit, in *Revue Biblique*, lvi. [1949] 189). Jeremias (*The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, 99) holds that the longer text is original, the omission representing a harmonizing attempt to delete a reference to the Ascension on Easter day. A. N. Wilder (in *Journal of Biblical Literature*, lxii. [1943]) also prefers the longer text (as does Benoit). J. H. Ropes, on the contrary (*The Beginnings of Christianity*, iii. 259 f.), suggests that reference to the Ascension was absent originally not only from Lk 24[51] but also from Ac 1[3]. In Ac 1[2] it is not omitted by any Greek MS, though there is variation in word order and though the Old Latin does omit it. In Ac 1[9] D sah have 'he was taken away' instead of 'lifted up' and omit 'as they were looking on.' The omission from Lk 24[51] (not confined to the 'Western' text) must be taken seriously; but the matter still leaves much scope for guess-work.

[2] Ac 13[31] alludes to the appearing of Jesus 'for many' (or, several) 'days'; 10[41] '. . . us . . . who ate and drank with him,' specifies no period.

[3] 'Ascension' (going up) and 'assumption' (being taken up) amount to much the same thing (cf. 'resurrection' and 'being raised'). In 1 P 3[22] the verb is simply 'to go'; in He 4[14] Jesus has 'passed through the heavens.' There is also the verb 'to exalt.' Only at Lk 9[51] does a noun (ἀνάλημψις) appear.

events.[1] They all point in the direction of making 'resurrection' and 'ascension' interchangeable or identical, rather than of distinguishing them as two separate stages.[2] The terms used (as also the 'heavenly session') mean, broadly, Christ's glorification—the antecedents or accompaniment of the gift of the Spirit.[3]

Thus, it will be as well to enquire forthwith whether the 'forty days' element really belongs to the author of the Acts at all. Its authenticity has been challenged from time to time, and among the most recent attempts to excise it is that of Dr. P. H. Menoud of Neuchâtel.[4] There is not space here to discuss his arguments.[5] I can only say that I believe that, when examined, his case for interpolation is not a cogent one, at any rate on the literary level.[6] It may be remarked, further, that there are signs elsewhere in Luke–Acts of failure to revise the work;[7] and discrepancies may be easier to account for in this way than by assuming alien interpolation.

Perhaps the strongest evidence against the forty days, however, is from outside the New Testament. The early liturgical tendency seems to have been to celebrate the gospel as a whole, not piecemeal. Good Friday and Easter were one. Even Whitsun can only be traced back, as a separate festival, as far as Tertullian's time.[8] There seems to have been no separate festival of the Ascension until the latter part of the fourth century,[9] and then, as it seems, under the influence of the Acts chronology. The Ascension is mentioned as a festival earlier, but as observed on the same day as Pentecost—fifty, not forty, days after Easter.[10] Yet, all said and done, it is questionable whether evidence of liturgical observance necessarily constitutes evidence against the first disciples' actual experience or the narrative traditions. It may be a useful pointer to theological interpretation underlying liturgical practice; indeed, the New Testament itself, as we have seen, may conflate different 'moments' in its theological expressions (sometimes under the influence of Old Testament or Rabbinic concepts, as in the case of Ps 68). But that does not necessarily mean that, in *narrative* form, the 'moments' were not from the first distinguishable. In religious art, all sorts of admittedly different incidents are often brought together in a single, collective scene, without any intention of denying their historical separateness. The only considerable non-Lucan *narrative* evidence which seems to contradict the forty days is [Mk] $16^{19f}$. But this is widely agreed to be of inferior accuracy, and is presumably more likely to have been theologically conditioned

[1] They are: Lk $24^{51}$ (in the longer text; and even in the shorter, a *parting* is referred to, apparently as having taken place on Easter day); [Mk] $16^{19}$; Ac $1^{2}$ (implying that it had already taken place before the events about to be narrated); $1^{9}$ (supposing this verse were taken without reference to $1^{3}$); $2^{33}$; Jn $20^{17}$ (cf. $3^{13}$ $6^{62}$. John 21, however, describes a subsequent appearance in Galilee). Elsewhere in the New Testament allusions to Christ's ascension, assumption, or going heavenward are found in Eph $1^{20}$ (by implication) $4^{8}$ ff., 1 Ti $3^{16}$, He $4^{14}$ (cf. $9^{24}$), 1 P $3^{22}$; and cf. Ro $10^{6}$. Incidentally, there are striking parallels, as is well known, in To $12^{16-22}$, where the angel Raphael divulges his identity. This causes alarm, but he says, 'Fear not . . . I appeared to you (*ὠπτανόμην ὑμῖν*) all those days, yet I did not eat or drink but it was a vision you were seeing (cf. Lk $24^{39-43}$, Ac $10^{41}$). And now praise God, for I am ascending to him who sent me (*ἀναβαίνω πρὸς τὸν ἀποστείλαντά με*) . . .' And they saw him no more. But they acknowledged the great and marvellous deeds of God.

[2] Cf. Barnabas $15^{9}$ . . . *τὴν ὀγδόην . . . ἐν ᾗ καὶ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἀνέστη ἐκ νεκρῶν καὶ φανερωθεὶς ἀνέβη εἰς οὐρανούς*; Aristides, *Apol.*, 15: *μετὰ δὲ τρεῖς ἡμέρας ἀνεβίω καὶ εἰς οὐρανοὺς ἀνῆλθεν.*

[3] The chief Old Testament background is Ps $68^{18}$, whether in its Rabbinical interpretation as quoted in Eph $4^{8}$, which speaks of *giving* gifts, or in its Biblical form, alluded to, perhaps in Ac $2^{33}$, which has *receiving* instead of giving. In either case, the Psalm was applied by Jewish interpreters to Moses, who ascended the mount to receive the Torah from God and give it to men (see Strack-Billerbeck on Eph $4^{8}$ and H. Kretschmar in *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, lxvi. [1954–55] 209 ff.): and Christians saw in Christ the new Moses. Psalm $110^{1}$ (the session at God's right hand) was also associated in Christian exegesis with the Ascension.

[4] 'Remarques sur les textes de l'ascension dans Luc-Actes,' in *Neutestamentliche Studien für Bultmann* [Berlin, 1954], 148 ff.

[5] See a discussion in E. Haenchen, *Die Apostelgeschichte* [Göttingen, 1956], 115 ff.

[6] Note, in passing, that there is no necessary discrepancy between Bethany (Lk $24^{50}$) and the Mount of Olives (Ac $1^{12}$): there is reason to believe that Bethany was on the Mount of Olives. See *The Beginnings of Christianity*, v. 475 f.

[7] See THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, LXV. vii. [April, 1954] 220 f.

[8] Unless Ac $20^{16}$ and 1 Co $16^{8}$ are allusions to it as a *Christian* festival.

[9] Augustine, *Ep.*, liv., claims it as likely to have been initiated by the apostles themselves; but, in fact, his is perhaps the earliest evidence.

[10] Etheria [A.D. 389], *Peregrinatio ad loca sancta*, 43, alludes to a special feast at Bethlehem (for a suggested explanation, see J. G. Davies in *Vigiliæ Christianæ*, viii. [1954] 93 ff.); but (as Kretschmar observes, *loc. cit.*) she expressly alludes to the Ascension as observed on the afternoon of the same day on which Pentecost was celebrated in the morning.

than Luke–Acts—for Luke is, after all, the self-confessed *narrator* of the New Testament (Lk $1^{1ff.}$).

Supposing then, that, after all, the forty days are not so easily dismissed, what happens if we try to come to terms with them? We are faced with the old problem of the apparent discrepancy as between Jerusalem and Galilee in the post-Resurrection narratives.[1] Now, the only circumstantial account of the beginning of the Christian Church among the apostles is St. Luke's, who locates it at Jerusalem.[2] If, then, we try, for the moment, assuming that it began not at Passover-it me but later, how much later would it be? The next most likely occasion for men of Galilee to be in Jerusalem is, of course, the next festival, namely Pentecost. And Pentecost, about fifty days after Passover, or about forty days after the octave of Passover (the end of the feast of Unleavened Bread), fits the forty days' appearances plus a short period of waiting. Where would the Galileans have been meanwhile? Surely, in Galilee. As soon as a festival was over, these people, who had no home, and indeed found even temporary lodging difficult enough, in Jerusalem or its environs, would naturally return home (cf. Lk $2^{43}$ $24^{13}$). Nothing but an express command, or extraordinary circumstances, would hold them in Jerusalem, beyond the week of Unleavened Bread (at the end of which Jn 20 places the last Jerusalem appearance). In both Lk $24^{49}$ and Ac $1^{4}$ there *is* an express command to stay. But whereas Lk $24^{49}$ admittedly seems to be in the paschal context, Ac $1^{4}$ puts it shortly before Pentecost. The tradition of a command to stay is exclusively Lucan (assuming, now, the genuineness of the opening verses of Acts); and there seems to be no reason to believe that Luke's second thoughts (Ac $1^{4}$) were not better informed than his first. Is there not some case, then, for believing that there is substance both in the Jerusalemite and in the Galilean traditions of appearances? In the interval between Passover-Unleavened Bread and Weeks (Pentecost), the disciples had naturally gone home to Galilee and had seen Jesus there, just as they had seen Him in Jerusalem during the paschal octave; and Mk $16^{7}$ *πρόαγει ὑμᾶς εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν* (cf. Mt $28^{7}$) need only mean 'When you return to Galilee (as you naturally will) you will find that He has preceded you.' The fact, moreover, that of all the Jewish festivals, only Passover and Pentecost were taken into the Christian calendar is also perhaps a pointer to Pentecost as a decisive point in the traditions.[3] And it must be noted that there is nothing absolutely discrepant with this suggestion except Lk $24^{49ff.}$, [Mk] $16^{19f.}$, and Ac $1^{2}$. Even the Matthean commission (Mt $28^{18-20}$) on a mountain in Galilee does not preclude a command to go up to Jerusalem for the forthcoming festival and start to implement the commission there.[4] Even the Johannine 'I am ascending' (Jn $20^{17}$), and the account of the bestowal of the Spirit at Easter ($20^{22}$) do not tie us to a chronology, in view of the Fourth Evangelist's theological emphasis, and in view of the fact that, in any case, there follows the Galilean ch. 21 (if it is Johannine). Is it not, then, simpler to postulate that Luke did alter his opinion about the chronology [5] when he wrote Ac $1^{3ff.}$, without harmonizing the story, than to assume an interpolator who deliberately interpolates but has not the deliberateness to tidy up? The command to stay in the city, on that showing, was actually part of the events on the eve of Pentecost, though Luke did not find this out until he came to write Ac $1^{3ff.}$, having previously supposed it to be Paschal.

### The Ascension Story

Would it follow that we must take quite literally the circumstantial account of the Ascension (Ac $1^{9-11}$)? What is the modern mind to make of the upward movement, the intercepting cloud, the straining eyes of the disciples, the apparition of the evidently supernatural figures, and the promise that Christ would come again, exactly as He had gone? Is not such literalism altogether

[1] I am well aware of the prevailing fashion for interpreting 'Jerusalem' and 'Galilee' as essentially *theological* symbols, and therefore more or less giving up the search for *historical* tradition behind their use. But I confess that I am profoundly sceptical of such an attitude. At any rate, why not try once more treating them literally?

[2] Besides Acts, note also Gal $1^{17}$. See, however, E. Lohmeyer, *Galiläa und Jerusalem*, for suggestions about a parallel development of Christianity in Galilee. It is interestingly discussed in F. C. Grant's *The Earliest Gospel*, ch. 6; but however far one is prepared to go with Lohmeyer (and much of his thesis seems to rest on the slenderest evidence), it is still not wholly relevant to the beginning of the Church of the *apostles*. For this, such evidence as there is points to Jerusalem, unless Mt $28^{18-20}$ be pressed to mean the founding of the apostolic community in Galilee (see below).

[3] See Kretschmar, *loc. cit.*

[4] Cf. B. W. Bacon's suggestion (*Jesus and Paul* [1921], 113) that the manifestation to more than five hundred (1 Co $15^{6}$) might have been just before the company of believers went up to Jerusalem at Pentecost.

[5] See Benoit, *loc. cit.*, 193; and cf. M. S. Enslin, in *Journal of Biblical Literature*, xlvii. [1928], 61 and n. 2, 64, 72 (he thinks that the forty days is due partly to Pentecost being the term, partly to Biblical and apocryphal analogies).

too crude for the integrity of a serious-minded person to-day? In reply, let it be said that it is questionable whether even St. Luke himself, for all his known tendency to 'materialize,'[1] was so literal-minded as to imagine that Jesus went up vertically and sat down a few miles above the visible sky. But he clearly believed that something significant did 'happen'; and whatever sort of historicity we are prepared to accord to the post-Resurrection appearances generally, and (for that matter) to the Transfiguration, ought not to be denied *a priori* to the Ascension, although it is circumstantially attested only in Luke–Acts and has peculiarities of its own. It is described as a decisive and deliberate withdrawal from sight, to be distinguished from the mere 'disappearance' in the Emmaus story (ἄφαντος ἐγένετο ἀπ' αὐτῶν). May we not accept it as such? It is a vision (if we choose to use that question-begging word) of the closing of a chapter. It is like an acted declaration of finality. Or (for this is equally true), it is an acted declaration of the opening of a new chapter; it is a matter of finality only within a certain period, for it is expressly linked with the hope of Christ's return. In short, there seems to be no intrinsic reason for not accepting the Ascension as something (of course we cannot define precisely what) which vividly and ocularly conveyed these convictions to the disciples.[2]

### St. Paul and the Ascension of Believers

But if so, why does not St. Paul endorse it? That he ignores the idea of the Ascension as setting a term to the appearances, and (in 1 Co $15^{8}$) reckons the Damascus road encounter as another appearance of the Risen Christ in the same series as the others, is a well-known fact. It may, however, perhaps be explained along the following lines. 'Decisive withdrawal' obviously had meaning only to the disciples who had first known Jesus from the 'earthly' side, during His ministry. They had seen Him risen, and they now had to learn that a term must be set to this type of intercourse. They must learn that Christ's risen body was not of this world only, but transcended it. St. Paul, by contrast, began, as it were, at the opposite end. For him, 'the Lord from heaven' was the manner of his first experience of Jesus; and he naturally therefore ranked the Damascus road experience, for that reason, side by side with the encounters which, for the Eleven and their companions, were the beginning of their knowledge of the Risen Lord. Never having known the Lord before the Crucifixion,[3] St. Paul has no need to learn His heavenly, transcendental nature by a decisive withdrawal: the Lord was manifestly already 'in heaven.'[4]

Moreover, on the positive side, St. Paul's teaching throws some light on a matter of great importance, namely, the relation between the Ascension of Jesus and the hope for 'those who are in Christ.' For it seems to be true to say that ascension, no less than resurrection, is part of the Christian hope for all believers, and that here St. Paul's teaching is relevant to our theme. The Pharisaic doctrine of bodily resurrection tended to link resurrection closely with this world-order; and Christian expectation was no doubt coloured with the same brush. Besides, Christ's own resurrection was, in some sense, realized 'on earth': His risen self became visible in time and space. But Christian thought, at its most authentic, was not earthbound or materialistic. Christ had Himself rebuked the Sadducees for assuming a crass materialism as the only conditions for the Pharisaic hopes which they were mocking (Mk $12^{25}$); and Christian hope looked on to new heavens and a new earth. And the 'symbol' for the transition from the one to the other, as well as for the organic linking together of the two, was 'ascension,' or 'assumption.' First the conquest of death, then transition; first resurrection, then ascension: this seems to have been the expected succession of events. It is part of the logic of the resurrection of the body—indeed, of the Incarnation.

For Christ Himself,[5] the pattern was first the acceptance of death, and so the conquest of it; and then the 'ascent' to a fuller sphere of life. And equally Christians hoped that they too would, in Christ, be brought from this life to the other. 1 Thessalonians $4^{17}$ expresses this hope of transition, both for 'the dead in Christ' and for those who were to survive to the *parousia*. And Rev $11^{12}$, after describing the death and resurrection (*v.* 11) of the two witnesses, describes their

[1] As in the 'bodily form' of the dove at the baptism, and the 'flesh and bones' and the fish of Lk $24^{39.\ 42}$.

[2] Luke and Matthew are interestingly conflated in Chatterton Dix's hymn, 'Alleluia! sing to Jesus!', in the lines:

> Though the cloud from sight received Him,
> When the forty days were o'er,
> Shall our hearts forget His promise,
> 'I am with you evermore'?

[3] Not, at any rate, as a disciple knows Him.

[4] What is striking is that (as Professor J. Knox shows, in *Chapters in a Life of Paul*, 121 ff.) St. Paul seems to distinguish the Damascus road encounter from his subsequent 'trances' or 'visions.' It was not only the beginning but also the end of that particular sort of encounter. In its own way it was as final and decisive as was the Ascension for the others.

[5] As, perhaps, for the 'Human figure' of Dn 7 (?).

upward summons and their ascension 'in the cloud' (though cf. $4^1$).

The objection which a large section of Christendom feels to the Roman dogma of the assumption of the Virgin is not that the New Testament does not contemplate the *ultimate* ascension of any besides Christ Himself. Rather, it is, first, that there is no shred of reliable evidence for the assumption of the Virgin; and, secondly, that to find this unique *anticipation* of the Christian hope in this one instance besides that of the Saviour himself is manifestly one more step in Roman theology towards the assimilating of the Virgin with Christ as Co-redemptrix. The New Testament hope is for the *ultimate* ascension of all alike who are in Christ; but only because of Christ's conquest of death and His pioneer ascension. He is the 'first fruits.' The New Testament knows of no favoured mortal of the Christian era who has already anticipated this hope.[1] It is part of the hope of the consummation—one of 'the last things'; and it is to be interpreted, like the rest of the symbolism of eschatology, in terms of the corporate fellowship of the redeemed with one another in the Risen Body of Christ. It is one more element in the total reality of our gathering together in the heavenly realm. The resurrection and ascension of Christ are two moments in the anticipation of the ultimate home-gathering of the whole people of God.

### Conclusions

Thus, just as the *parousia* may be thought of as linking heaven to earth, so the Ascension (of Christ and then of believers) links earth with heaven: it completes the 'saving history' in which God redeems His creation and brings His Church into complete fellowship with Himself in Jesus. Christ's ascension 'means the taking up to heaven of the humanity which the Son had assumed at the moment of the Incarnation.'[2] Theologically, therefore, it is by no means an isolated or exclusively Lucan idea. It is a vivid way of expressing an essential Christian truth—that Christ was not somehow 'dematerialized' like a sort of ghost, but that He is fully Himself, although no longer limited by 'earthly' existence. This is, presumably, what the fourth of the Thirty-Nine Articles is getting at, although it puts it in a strangely materialistic shape, when it says: 'Christ did truly rise again from death, and took again His body, with flesh, bones, and all things appertaining to the perfection of Man's nature; wherewith He ascended into Heaven, and there sitteth. . . .' Furthermore, if the Ascension 'means the taking into heaven of the humanity which the Son had assumed,' it means that with it will be taken the humanity which He has redeemed—those who are Christ's, at His coming. It is a powerful expression of the *redemption* of this world, in contrast to mere *escape* from it.

Finally, what of the question of historicity? The Person of Christ unifies and brings together to a brilliant focal point all the varied aspects of God's manifold work of redemption. In this sense, all the distinguishable 'moments'—baptism, transfiguration, crucifixion, resurrection, ascension, session at God's right hand, giving of the Spirit, *parousia*—stand for the sure though mysterious good news of the glory of God revealed and communicated in Christ. Sometimes they are seen all conflated together, as the Fourth Gospel tends to show them. Sometimes one or two of them alone are dominant or do duty for the rest—in St. Paul, the Cross and Resurrection, in the Epistle to the Hebrews, the Death and Ascension. And yet, Christian thought, apparently following eyewitness traditions, did find itself driven at times to analyse and distinguish these 'moments' as successive component parts of a single whole. No language can get far in adumbrating such profundities. But among these component parts the Ascension carries its own special significance as the closing of one chapter and the opening of the next, the linking of one world with the other, the seal upon the eternal meaning of the humanity of Christ, and the anticipation, in Him, of God's design for the whole Body of Christ. As such, it seems to demand a position 'in history' as truly as the others. If the eternal Word of God became incarnate at a definite time, is it not understandable that at a definite time He should also be seen to have passed on into a wider existence? And although it would be reducing its meaning and behaving childishly with deep mysteries to treat the Ascension with a bare and annalistic 'historicism,' and although the present writer would be the last to dogmatize about the forty days, yet a better case may be made than is sometimes imagined for 'dating' the event in the manner indicated in the opening verses of the Acts.

[1] In the Old Testament tradition a very few favoured persons were believed to have made the transition without death: Enoch and Elijah in the canonical, Moses, possibly, in the non-canonical Scriptures. But Moses was *both* buried *and* translated: *i.e.* it is a dualistic idea; the 'soul' is translated. The so-called *Assumption of Isaiah* describes a prophetic trance and a return to the body (cf. Rev 4). Of course there are passages in the New Testament where resurrection and ascension are described as already belonging to Christians (Eph $2^6$, Col $3^{1\cdot3}$); but this is a matter of proleptic possession, in Christ, of what Christ has won.

[2] J. G. Davies, *loc. cit.*, 97

# The Eastern Way

By the Reverend G. F. Mobbs, M.A., Harbottle, Morpeth

The Old Testament is essentially an Eastern Book, and the actions it records are the actions of Eastern men. And Eastern men deal with situations in a manner natural enough for them, but with a slant of thought and attitude of mind often so different from our ordinary Western approach that, unless we understand and make due allowance, we may unknowingly misinterpret motives and in some cases seriously misjudge actions done by men from whose conduct we are trying to draw some lesson for our own lives. It may, therefore, be worth while for the writer of these notes to pass on what he has gathered not from argument or supposition but from the comments, and sometimes indeed the similar actions, of pastors and preachers in a country district of China where they still thought and tackled their problems in the old way that came natural to them—the Eastern way.

The Eastern way prefers a cautious line of approach, whereby a man avoids as much awkwardness as he can both for himself and for the person with whom he is dealing. He can still deal firmly and toughly with a situation, but by an indirect approach he can add politeness where politeness is desired, and keep open an easier way of retreat if things take a wrong turn.

A good example of this habitual caution is seen in the questioning of Jehu by a brother officer (2 K 9), Jehu's reply and subsequent developments. Jehu has been taken aside and secretly anointed new king of Israel by Elisha's messenger, and comes out from the room with an excitement only half concealed, that at once draws, as he wished, a question from the officer : ' Is all well ? wherefore came this mad fellow to thee ? ' The question, as by second nature, is well put, with the right guardedness. If Jehu's account of the message meets with expressions of horror or even disapproval, or just silence, no harm or awkwardness need ensue, for hadn't the questioner already declared that in his opinion the messenger was a mad fellow ? And the cue is duly followed. ' Ye know the man and his communication,' says Jehu ; and the officers in a body say, ' It is false ' (that clears them all of any involvement in the message, should it prove unwelcomed) ; but then, thus covered, they go on to press for it—' Tell us now.' With that cover provided for them, one and all, Jehu could speak plainly—' Thus and thus spake he unto me, saying, Thus saith the Lord, I have made thee king over Israel.' The cover wasn't needed—they proved all of one mind, and they at once enthusiastically proclaimed Jehu king. But that procedure was the right, the natural way in Eastern eyes.

Both caution and politeness are well displayed in Jacob's meeting with Esau in Gn 33. Jacob bows low before his brother, and his wives and children and handmaids bow low too, in humble acknowledgment of Esau's superiority, with his magnificent following of four hundred fighting Arabs. And Jacob had paved the way to mollified feelings with his magnificent peace-offering of the wealth the desert understood—drove following drove of goats, sheep, camels, cattle and asses—all for Esau. Esau is flattered and moved, and he'll take the valuable gift. But, of course, the first thing to say was, ' I have enough, my brother ; keep that thou hast unto thyself.' And Jacob knows what he must do—he must insist, with more flattery, on Esau accepting the gift. And, of course, in the end Esau lets himself be persuaded. Then it was up to Esau to make a generous move. ' Let us take our journey,' he said, ' and let us go, and I will go before thee.' Jacob was far too wise to accept that—it would have been the last thing those fighting Arabs wanted, to crawl along with a huge motley caravan with women and children. It was the proper generous gesture for Esau to make, but it was only meant to go as far as words ; and Jacob did the proper thing in refusing the offer. ' Then let me leave some of my men as an escort,' urged Esau, still in the best form. But, also in the best form, and prudently (for it was better to leave well alone) Jacob protested that there was no need even for that. And the two brothers parted safely in the best of humour, with all courtesies properly exchanged and pressed, and no real inconvenience caused.

Abraham's buying of Machpelah as a burying-place for Sarah is another instance of correct procedure in Eastern eyes. The buying of a grave site is an important matter, and it takes a whole chapter in Genesis (ch. 23) to record it. To wrangle over a grave would be the height of disrespect to the dead ; and that was duly recognized by both sides. The seller would know that he could ask far more than the current price for his land and that the buyer would not niggle. And the buyer knew he could reap two advantages from a high price—it would redound to the honour of the dead, and also form his best ' legal ' protection.

he price paid would be the topic of much almost wed gossip afterwards, and that would be the ost powerful witness to the purchase that could e desired, for it could never be challenged, or nied, with success after such talk by so many.

But there was still a difficulty to negotiate. ough it was quite expected that the owner of a ave site would get a very handsome price for his d, yet it was not honourable for him to appear atantly to make profit out of another's sorrow. phron got over that difficulty in thoroughly rect manner. 'Nay, my lord, hear me,' he says, 'The field I give thee, and the cave that is therein, give it thee; in the presence of the sons of my ople give I it thee: bury thy dead.' Of course raham would not take it as a free gift, he was t meant to. So, bowing and acknowledging the urtesy, he goes on to talk of payment.

Still Ephron can't speak outright—he'll bring e price in indirectly, with delicacy. 'Land,' he ys, 'worth four hundred shekels of silver, what that betwixt me and thee? bury therefore thy ad.' Four hundred shekels, when a boy slave ke Joseph could be bought for twenty. High ice, indeed, for a field and a cave. But Abraham ould not haggle over Sarah's burying-place. And Abraham weighed to Ephron the silver, hich he had named in the audience of the sons Heth, four hundred shekels of silver, current th the merchant.' There would be no doubt terwards who had bought that ground at what ice; nor would any want to go back on that rgain.

Another case of satisfying correctness in pro-dure, not always recognized by us, is the way in nich David offered himself as champion against liath. How could he, a stripling, manage that thout presumption? Even after Saul's public oclamation it would be unthinkable presumption go up boldly to the king and offer himself. avid's course was to go up to just ordinary people d ask them, one after another, 'What shall be ne to the man that killeth this Philistine, and keth away the reproach from Israel? for who is is uncircumcised Philistine, that he should defy e armies of the living God?' David knew the swer, but that was his way of making known his n indignation and readiness. And the people ew what to do—they duly passed on David's rds till they reached the king's ear. And then ul sent for David, and David could then appear fore him with perfect propriety.

Such incidents contain features of Eastern finesse at are worth appreciation, but there is little in em to cause serious misconception to the Western nd. But in Exodus there is a passage where oses is still resisting God's command to go to ypt and deliver his people, which seems really to have mystified at least some Western commentators. Moses has argued at length with God, and God has patiently refuted his arguments; and then, in Ex $4^{12-14}$, we come to these words: 'Now therefore [said the Lord to Moses] go, and I will be thy mouth, and teach thee what thou shalt speak.' And Moses said, 'O Lord, send, I pray thee, by the hand of him whom thou wilt send.' And then the Bible goes on, 'And the anger of the Lord was kindled against Moses.' Western commentaries have taken Moses' reply to have been at last a grudging submission to God's will; but then they find it difficult to explain why that answer served to kindle the anger of a God till then so long-suffering. But in that reply of Moses the Easterner sees Moses not grudgingly submitting, but rather, politely but definitely, refusing to go. It can still happen thus in modern times. A man is approached and asked to do some service. He raises all manner of objections; but when these are successfully countered, and he has little more to say, but still within himself is determined not to comply, the man does not give an outright refusal—that would be too discourteous—but at some point he pulls up the discussion, and then blandly starts the matter off again right from its beginning, as if it had never been discussed, leaving this time himself completely out of it and discussing it now for somebody else. Moses did just that. God had already chosen him; but Moses implies that that is now definitely out of the question; God must think again—of some one else. 'O Lord,' he says, 'send, I pray thee, by the hand of him whom thou wilt send.' And God sees the implied refusal, and then, understandably, is angry.

A still more serious instance of misconception occurs in what seems to be the usual Western interpretation of David's and Uriah's actions over David's sin with Bathsheba. The average Western commentary paints David's conduct in the blackest colours, set against unqualified nobility in Uriah. This, for instance, is one comment: 'The king makes an attempt to conceal his deed (of adultery with Bathsheba), but the self-denial of Uriah renders it unsuccessful. . . . The story shows the depths to which an Oriental despot can descend, and the nobility of Uriah makes the abject treachery of his master all the darker.' But was the situation so simply pure black and white as that? That is not the conclusion reached by at least some Eastern minds. To them the situation is as follows. David, walking one evening on the flat roof of his palace, sees beautiful Bathsheba washing. That in itself is rather surprising, for Eastern women do not let themselves easily be seen washing; and the more beautiful they are, the greater care they take that no one should be wrongly attracted to them. It almost seems as

though Bathsheba was not so averse to the king seeing her as she should have been.

In any case, David saw her and sent for her, and she went to him ; and the result was that afterwards she sent him the brief message, ' I am with child.' It was a serious matter for her—how would her husband deal with her, when he came home from the war ? And it was a still more serious matter for David. What would be the effect on the fighting quality and loyalty of his officers if they heard that, while they were away fighting his battles, the king was tampering with the wife of one of their number ? Whose wife might not come next ?

David could not alter the fact, however sorry he might be for it now, so he got Uriah sent back to him with despatches, and then bade him go home and rest. There would then be another very natural reason for the birth of a baby in due course.

But Uriah, as our modern phrase would say, ' wasn't having any.' He knew what had happened, or from hints dropped had a very shrewd guess, and he wasn't going to let David or his wife off thus lightly. He'd give them no cover, let the world know how David treated his officers. That would teach him a lesson—he wouldn't do *that* again in a hurry. So of set purpose Uriah kept away from home. Next day David, who was duly told, asked Uriah why he had not gone home. Uriah wasn't fool enough to say outright in the king's court the real reason—his suspicions and resentment ; instead, as so often in the East, he gave, not the truest but the most unassailable reason he could think of, while his comrades were deprived of the company of their wives, should he enjoy his ? It was not a very natural thought for a soldier on leave to have, and David was not likely to believe it, nor was Uriah really concerned that he should ; but it provided David with no handle for further useless argument when Uriah's mind was made up. It *was* made up —' As thou livest, and as thy soul liveth,' said Uriah, ' I will not do this thing.' David next evening made Uriah drunk, but even then Uriah kept hold of his resolve. And David knew then that there would be no softening in Uriah's resentment. How much disaffection would Uriah spread ? Better for all concerned if he were killed in the war. So that was arranged.

David sinned terribly, but if Uriah had loved his wife more, though she had been unfaithful, and if David had seen a trace of something finer than unrelenting resentment in Uriah with no trace of possible forgiveness in it, the issue might have been different. That is the lesson some Eastern minds have read from this sad story—a rather different lesson from that found by some Western commentators.

And what of Potiphar and his wife ? ' Potiphar was no fool,' is the comment I have heard in the East, ' He knew what Joseph was like and what his wife was like. But what could he do ? The only way to save his own face and his wife's was in the eyes of the world to believe her story and show anger and clap Joseph into prison. At least that way he sheltered his wife's reputation and the honour of his family.'

The Old Testament is full of feeling and very human problems. We shall see them more truly, and find them come still more alive for us, if we will keep in mind the Eastern way of presenting them and dealing with them.

# In the Study

## Virginibus Puerisque

### How the Horrid Corner was Changed into the Happy Corner

By Rita F. Snowden, Auckland, New Zealand

Once there was a famous artist called Edward Burne-Jones. His head was full of thoughts, and his hands were so clever that with paints and brushes he could make beautiful pictures. And they were so beautiful that people came from far and near to see them.

And this famous artist had a daughter ; and she had a daughter—a very little daughter. Edward Burne-Jones loved them both—his little granddaughter especially—and they had lovely times together.

Then, suddenly one evening, something happened —something sad. The little girl got into a naughty mood ; twice she disobeyed her mother, and her mother had to punish her. And while she sobbed, she stood in a corner. Of course, her grandfather, being a wise grandfather, couldn't interfere ; but he felt sad. And the little girl stood a long time sobbing in the corner. At last her sobs stopped, and she felt really sorry for what she had done. And when she told her mother and her grandfather that she was sorry it was time to kiss good night and climb up the stairs to bed.

First thing in the morning, when the sun came peeping into her room, waking her, she remembered

e night before. Slowly, she washed and dressed, d quietly she crept downstairs. When she got the closed door, she waited for some minutes. en, reaching up her two hands to the big door-ob, she turned it and went in. Already her ndfather was there busy with his paints. But e could not bear to look into his face; and she ok care not to look into that horrid corner. But en she did look into her grandfather's face she und there a beautiful smile. And that gave her urage to look into the horrid corner. And do u know, something had happened to that, too. wasn't a bit like it was when she stood sobbing it—before she had said she was sorry and was rgiven. For that morning—just to make it very in and sure that she was forgiven—her grand-ther had risen specially early, and with his paints d brushes had painted on the walls of that rrid corner, the happiest things he could think —little rabbits, and birds, and angels, and tterflies, and roses. Of course, it was the same rner; but in a way it wasn't at all the same—cause as soon as she said she was sorry she was rgiven, and that always changes things.

Her mother and her grandfather had learned at from Jesus. Once, you remember, Jesus had friend who got into naughty moods, and he nied Him beside a fire of coals. His name was ter. When somebody said that he was a friend Jesus, he said he wasn't, and that he didn't ow Him.

But that was only half the story. For after a hile, Peter was sorry—and Jesus forgave him side another fire of coals. So ever afterwards, stead of a fire of coals reminding him of a horrid ment, it reminded him of a happy one.

And that is still Jesus' way. A verse in the New stament says so. It says: 'If we confess our s, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins' Jn 1[9]). And that is some of the best news in e world—for that is how the horrid corners in r lives can be changed into happy ones.

---

## Wireless Needs Wires

THE REVEREND P. N. BUSHILL, B.A., WORTHING

'Who then is Paul, and who is Apollos, but ministers whom ye believed.'—1 Co 3[5].

In the early days of wireless—when the aerials re hung all down the garden like long washing-es—I remember seeing a funny picture of two ctricians outside a house with ladders and coils l coils of wire. 'What's happening at that se?' some one asked. 'Oh, they are having wireless put in,' was the reply. Wire*less*, but much wire. In these days, of course, the wires are not seen so prominently, but it is still true to-day that wireless, despite its name, needs wires, as this story goes to show.

Did you listen to 'Top of the Form' a short while ago, when a Dutch team at The Hague was competing with a British school, and when SILENCE suddenly fell upon the event? The next week the *Radio Times* published a short paragraph of explanation under the heading 'Late Cut.' 'G.P.O. and B.B.C. engineers,' it stated, 'sprang into action. Was the cable between Holland and England broken? The minutes ticked by. . . . Until one of the masters at the Lycéum, in The Hague, entered the Hall with an apologetic smile. A laboratory assistant in the school, finding the laboratory window open and, hating draughts, tried to shut it, but a wire passing through the window from outside made it impossible. Not to be outdone by a small piece of wire, he cut it and the slender link between Holland and England on which the broadcast depended was broken.'

So wireless needs wires! There must be some material contact between the unseen and the seen, the unknown and the known.

Surely here is one great reason why God sent His Son into the world. How can we see God who is invisible? John tells us 'No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him.' As we look at Jesus we see what God is like; as we listen to Jesus we hear the voice of God.

And how are men to know about Jesus? Of course, you say, they can go to church, but a great many people unfortunately don't go to church, and in some lands there is no church to go to. Well, you say, they can read the Bible; yes, but so many people to-day don't read the Bible, and there are some people who can't read at all! Then, how are they to know? Paul says to the Corinthian Christians 'You are the epistle of Christ'—the epistle or letter that can be seen and read by all. You may be only 'a small piece of wire,' but the broadcast, even overseas, may depend on you. When some people were inclined to exalt Paul into a very high position, he said, 'Who then is Paul, and who is Apollos, but ministers—servants—by whom ye believed.' Only a piece of wire, but what a Message to carry!

Christ has no hands but our hands
To do His work to-day.
He has no feet but our feet
To lead men in His way.
He has no tongue but our tongue
To tell men how He died,
He has no help but our help
To bring them to His side.

## The Christian Year

FIRST SUNDAY AFTER EASTER

### Learning To Let Go [1]

'Therefore let us . . . lay aside every weight, . . . and let us run with patience the race that is set before us.'—He 12[1] (R.V.).

One of Paul's favourite metaphors to describe the Christian Life is the idea—so familiar in the Greek world around him—of a *race*. The writer of the Letter to the Hebrews takes up the same idea. And he gives one supremely important maxim for all who would run well, a maxim in four words: *'laying aside every weight.'* The Christian must travel light.

To most of us this is hard teaching. We have an innate and strong instinct to clutch and cling and keep. We had it as babies, when our infant hands seemed to be fitted with strong steel springs, so that our little fingers closed tightly around whatever they touched! We have grown up; but we retain, strongly within us, this acquisitive and possessive instinct. In part it may spring from pride; still more, probably, from fear. To possess things, to have something to cling to, is to be more safe. And so our hands remain essentially clutching hands.

And the New Testament tells us that we have simply got to do something about this. Heaven is set before us, and

> There is a way for man to rise
> To that sublime abode.

But—to change the metaphor—that way is like a steep ladder, a ladder (as Francis Thompson has it) 'Pitched betwixt Heaven and Charing Cross.' Now you cannot climb a ladder with full hands.

Here is a lesson we all need to learn. We must learn to 'let go.' There comes to my mind an unforgettable incident from a sailing holiday I had long ago with four friends on the Norfolk Broads. (One of them, by the way, is now an Anglican Bishop.) One afternoon one *very* raw initiate was left in charge of the 'sheet,' the rope that controls the swing of the main-sail. Quite suddenly we turned from a sheltered stretch of river into open water, and an unexpectedly strong beam-wind smote the side of our little craft. All would have been well had my friend relaxed his hold on the sheet, and let the wind have its way with the sail. But he had been told to hold that rope. Taut and tense, our main-sail bowed itself before the full force of the wind, and our poor boat heeled right over. As we scrambled out of our now chaotic cabin, and the waters of Norfolk poured in, there could be heard the grim voice of one under great stress, fighting a losing battle with Nature, and crying desperately: 'I can't hold on any tighter!' To which the prospective Bishop, soaked with the waters we were shipping, shouted back: 'Let go, you chump, *let go*!'

We must learn how and when to 'let go,' I think, on three levels.

(1) *Stop clinging to* THINGS. *Let go your clutching hold upon material possessions.* Jesus has some very pointed things to say about our possessions. He does not say that in themselves they are evil; but He does suggest that they are liabilities which can fatally weigh us down—or trip us up—on our spiritual pilgrimage. He does not condemn the man who is found with wealth in his hand, but He does condemn the tight closing of a fist over that wealth. The tragedy of the rich young ruler was not that he *had* great possessions but that, offered a greater gift, he could not *let them go*.

Could we? How easily the possessive instinct grows upon us! I think of some of my businessmen friends and farmers (why especially farmers, I wonder?) whose mentality about money really troubles me. They are not bad men, but good. Yet quietly, unobtrusively, the making and holding of money has moved up their scale of values until it is now at the top. It's like a game of Monopoly; but the fever has caught them and they have simply got to win. Let us not be afraid of the money that passes through our hands; but let us be very afraid of any temptation to clutch and keep it because of the safety, prestige or power that it is supposed to confer. Let us hold our possessions with an easy open hand; ready to let go whenever heaven beckons us.

(2) *Stop clinging to* FIXED IDEAS. *Do not fetter your thinking.* In a non-political, non-party sense we nearly all tend to be conservatives. That is, 'what we have we hold'; we cling firmly to what our present has inherited from our past. This is especially true of our thinking. We are ready to consider new ideas, but no old ones must be given up. I once knew an old lady who lived in a quite unbelievable room. From floor to ceiling it was full—of junk. The things she really needed were buried under things she did not. Our minds are often like that old lady's room, cluttered up by thoughts and ideas no longer relevant, nor wholesome to preserve. There are unexamined prejudices, outworn *clichés* and conventions, ancient grievances and resentments, tattered fragments of remorse and regret, often a cherished justification for Being an Invalid and perhaps a self-portrait in a gilt frame—'An Important Person,' 'A Person

[1] This, in longer form, will be found in a new collection of sermons by the Rev. David N. Francis—*But Above All*. A review of the volume appears in 'Literature.'

who Could have been Important,' or 'A Person who Hasn't Had a Chance.' While we clutch at What Has Been—or Might Have Been—we have no hand free to take hold of What Is—and What can Be. We must let go.

We must let go of evil thoughts, too. The writer to the Hebrews urges us to 'lay aside' not only 'every weight' but also 'the sin which doth so easily beset us.' Our instinct is to grapple and wrestle with our temptations. His advice is that (in a much more relaxed mood) we should 'let them go.' There is an ironic sense in which the more we 'take a firm hold' on our evil thoughts, the more they tend to get a firm hold on us.

(3) *Stop clinging to* PEOPLE. *Do not try to possess other persons.* Here we face one of our most subtle and deadly temptations. There are commitments between friends, mutual responsibilities within families, and sacred ties that we recognize when we marry. But *there is no relationship on earth which gives us rights over the personality of another.* The individual soul—even of your offspring, or your partner in marriage—must remain free. To coerce another life, however gently, to seek to bend another's will or mould another's mind—in short, to possess a person—is one of the worst sins. It is doubly sinful, for while all possessiveness hurts the one who clutches, this kind hurts other people too. It violates their personality.

Examples abound all around us. And it is strange that we, who would be so shocked by sins of a grosser kind, seem to accept—and often hardly to question—this one. Here is a church official of the most gentle sort; but quietly and competently he has 'absorbed' and now dominates his own life. Here is a devout lady who would not dream of capturing some one else's husband; yet most purposefully she is trying to capture and keep her own growing daughter. Here is a youth who eyes his beloved with a jealous concern, and (while away in the Forces) will not allow her to dance or go out with any one else, because she is 'his.' O beware most of all of this kind of possessiveness! It can ensnare the nicest of people and the best intentioned. Think for a moment of those whose lives are most closely bound up with yours. Ask yourselves, ask God to show you—Are these people free? Do you *want* them to be free?

The final purpose of our learning to 'let go' is not just that we may be fair to others, not just that we may save our souls from the corruption of possessiveness and the lust of power. Paul urges that men should let go their hold upon many things *in order* 'that they may lay hold on the life that is life indeed.' We who are seeking for the Lover of our souls, what shall we do if, when we meet, our hands are clutching many things? Remember that rapturous line in the Song of Songs: 'When I found him whom my soul loveth; *I held him*, and would not let him go!'

---

SECOND SUNDAY AFTER EASTER

## The Mystery of Suffering

BY THE REVEREND GRAHAM W. HARDY, B.D., S.T.M., EDINBURGH

'The Lord gave, and the Lord hath taken away; blessed be the name of the Lord.'—Job $1^{21}$.

The problem of suffering is as old as man. It has been called 'the greatest single obstacle to faith.' Why does God allow the innocent to suffer? Is He helpless or heartless? Is He less than omnipotent or less than all-loving?

Here is the problem forced upon the Hebrew dramatist in the story of Job, who was 'perfect and upright, and one that feared God, and eschewed evil.' This good and prosperous man suddenly faces a succession of inexplicable calamities. Messengers arrive breathless with the staggering announcement of disasters of increasing severity—the loss of cattle, sheep, camels, servants, and finally his own family. Job is left alone with a broken heart. To complete his misery he suffers a loathsome disease of boils and leprous sores. His wife encourages him to curse God for his misfortune. Thus, in an extreme way, Job personifies the sufferer whose faith is stretched almost to breaking point and who seeks in despair for an answer to the question: 'Why does God allow it?'

At first, faith actually accentuates rather than solves the problem. Scepticism requires less effort of mind and heart. Why not abandon any attempt to reconcile the mysteries of human suffering and the purpose of a God of love? Many have echoed the grim stoicism of Henley—

> In the fell clutch of circumstance,
> I have not winced nor cried aloud.
> Under the bludgeonings of chance,
> My head is bloody but unbowed.

We may admire such courage, but it brings no comfort. Nor can we find an answer in the belief of a Mary Baker Eddy that pain is in fact non-existent. Faith makes the problem more acute. We look in vain for an easy, slick answer. A complete solution would, in fact, mean the end of faith.

Four rays of light show through the Book of Job to illuminate this most baffling of all mysteries.

(1) *The Connexion between Suffering and Sin.* Job's three 'comforters' all suggest that he must have offended the Almighty in some way, even unawares. 'Despise not thou the chastenings of the

Almighty.' Job realizes his many imperfections, but cannot find satisfaction in this explanation.

How many have been tormented with the suggestion that sickness or sorrow must be a form of Divine punishment. On the authority of Christ Himself we can dismiss this theory. When the man born blind was brought to Him, they asked, 'who did sin, this man, or his parents, that he was born blind?' And Jesus answered: 'Neither hath this man sinned, nor his parents.' And, again, referring to Pilate's slaughter of the Galilæans, Jesus said, 'Suppose ye that these Galilæans were sinners above all the Galilæans, because they suffered such things? I tell you, Nay: but, except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish. Or those eighteen, upon whom the tower in Siloam fell, and slew them, think ye that they were sinners above all men that dwelt in Jerusalem? I tell you, Nay.'

Suffering is not necessarily a direct result of sin, but it is all too tragically true that sin inevitably produces suffering. No sin is private; it is like sewage poured into a public river. One prodigal going his reckless way, one fool gambling with his soul, can bring sorrow to countless others. A Hitler, filled with the lust for power, can involve thousands of innocent victims in unspeakable suffering. The thirst for wealth and selfish exploitation of cheap labour brings the evil of slums and disease with the inevitable social problems that result. The human race is a family, albeit divided and quarrelsome, but still a family, where all must share in pain as well as pleasure.

(2) *Suffering as a Test.* The story of Job begins in the courts of heaven. Satan suggests that Job's goodness is only a result of his prosperity. Let disaster befall him and he will soon curse God. The challenge is accepted and God allows the disasters, confident that his faith will stand the test.

Here is a second ray of light on the problem. Not that God deliberately tortures His innocent children, but He *permits* suffering to test moral and spiritual fibres, to give an opportunity for His children to show the genuineness of their faith. Looking back at the end of his life, Principal Rainy confessed that there were some experiences almost too painful to remember, yet these were the periods he could least afford to have done without. 'The world is a failure as a pleasure garden,' said Dean Inge, 'but it was never meant to be a pleasure garden.'

So Job rises to this great cry of faith amid the darkness of his sorrows. 'The Lord hath given and the Lord hath taken away; blessed be the name of the Lord.' 'Though he slay me, yet will I trust in him.' 'I rejoice,' said the Apostle, 'that I have been *counted worthy* to suffer.' Instead of bitterly complaining at our unfair load of sorrow and pain, let us grasp this opportunity to show the worth of a faith that can stand the test of storms and strike even deeper roots.

(3) *Suffering's Answer in Eternity.* The Book of Job contains one of the few premonitions of life beyond death in the Old Testament. Job in the midst of his sorrow still cannot find final satisfaction in regarding his suffering as a testing of Providence. He is brought to the inevitable conclusion that this life cannot provide the whole answer. Many questions must remain unanswered, but one day he will know why. 'I know that my redeemer liveth, and . . . in my flesh shall I see God.' Then all the mystery and pain and sorrow will find its final answer in the light of eternity. 'Our light affliction, which is but for a moment, worketh for us a far more eternal weight of glory.' In this faith countless men and women down the ages have, like their Master, endured their cross in the hope of the joy that was set before them. When that modern martyr, Dietrich Bonhoeffer, was led out to be shot, at the Flossenburg concentration camp he said, without trace of fear, 'For me, this is the *beginning* of life.'

(4) *Suffering, an Avenue of God's Approach.* Job does not need to wait till after death for victory over his sorrows. He is brought to realize that suffering can be positive and creative here and now —actually a means of bringing the soul closer to God. After his ordeal he cries out with a new faith, 'I have heard of thee by the hearing of the ear: but now mine eye seeth thee.' Not in spite of his suffering, but *because* of it, he now has a clearer vision of God than ever before. 'I have known more of God since I came to this bed of pain,' said Ralph Erskine, 'than I have all my life.' This is the triumph of faith: to say with Baron von Hügel, 'I think we have got all our values wrong: suffering is the *crown of life*.'

Through fiery trials new opportunities of service are often opened up. Dr. Moon of Brighton, at the threshold of a brilliant career, was stricken with blindness, but instead of rebellion and bitterness, he offered back that 'talent of blindness' to Christ. He devised a system, which is still in use side by side with the Braille one. As a result of it millions of blind people can now read.

We cannot really begin to understand the Cross of Christ till we have taken up our cross and followed Him. It was said of St. Francis that the very wounds of Christ appeared in his hands and feet. Take courage, then, should you be called to shoulder some burden of suffering. Even though you reach the end of the journey scarred and marked through the struggle, these will be marks by which your Master will recognize you as His true disciple.

THIRD SUNDAY AFTER EASTER

## The Abolition of Death

BY THE REVEREND R. L. CHILD, M.A., B.D., OXFORD

'Our Saviour Jesus Christ . . . hath abolished death, and hath brought life and immortality to light through the gospel.'—2 Ti $1^{10}$.

What could be more absurd than to suggest that death has been abolished? Death is still, as it always has been, the one event which no living creature can escape. To quote Shirley's words:

There is no armour against fate;
Death lays his icy hand on kings:
Sceptre and crown
Must tumble down,
And in the dust be equal made
With the poor crooked scythe and spade.

Yet, for the Christian, this is far from being the last word. For the one thing about which the Church is supremely confident is that Jesus Christ has conquered death. He rose victorious from the grave, and we are assured that He is able to share His victory with those who trust in Him. As the Second Epistle to Timothy puts it: 'Our Saviour Jesus Christ . . . hath abolished death, and hath brought life and immortality to light through the gospel.' He has indeed! So then, death has both been abolished and yet still remains. What is the solution to this queer contradiction?

One answer is to say that believers in Jesus Christ have exhibited a greater degree of fortitude than other men in their dying. St. Athanasius went so far as to assert many centuries ago that the Christians of his day had such a contempt for death that 'they eagerly rush upon it, and become witnesses for the Resurrection the Saviour has accomplished against it.' Truly that was the spirit of the early martyrs. Yet it has not always been so; and, in any case, Christians have no monopoly of courage in the presence of death. Moreover, to affirm that some individuals have faced death unafraid is not really the same thing as saying that death has been abolished. In fact, if anything, it implies the contrary, for it suggests that death still faces us as an enemy to be met and mastered. And we all know how true that is. Undoubtedly some men and women have learned a new way of meeting death. Yet is that all that the 'abolition' of death means? I think not. But before going any further it should be noted that, in the Bible, the element of paradox attaches also to what we are told about the origin of death. Thus St. Paul says: 'Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned' (Ro $5^{12}$). Are we to conclude from this that, had it not been for the sin of Adam, there would have been no such thing as death in the world? We cannot answer that question for we do not know what our world would have been like had man never sinned. Yet there does not appear to be anything to connect the fall of the leaves in autumn, for example, or the dying of birds and beasts, with the fact of evil, however radically we may interpret Original Sin. It looks rather as though in any case the life of individual beings on this planet was designed by God to last for only a specified period of time and then cease. Yet even if that be so, and the fact of death is in that sense 'natural,' St. Paul was quite sure that it was also due in some sense to sin.

Thus, both the existence of death now and its origin suggest that, in some mysterious way, death would not be what it is were it not for the fact of sin. St. Paul was explicit, as we read in the lesson for to-day, on this point when he said: 'The sting of death is sin' (1 Co $15^{56}$). And he was also explicit about God's remedy for this situation, for he goes on to say: 'and the strength of sin is the law. But thanks be to God, which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ.' From this verse, at any rate, it is plain that Jesus Christ has done something to death which is over and above our individual reaction to it. He has so touched death that it has shrivelled into something different. It is still there before us all, and yet it is not there in the same sense as before Christ came. It has been 'abolished.'

Is it possible to see more clearly what exactly has happened? I think it is. Once more, St. Paul provides the clue when he says that Christ has abolished death by dealing with sin—in other words, by exposing and bringing to judgment that temper of mind and heart which renders the human will antagonistic to God and to His will. Let me illustrate this point by taking the case of a man who does not believe in God or in God's government of the world and of his life. Let us suppose that he is an eminently successful person whose interests and energies find adequate satisfaction within the limits of this present life, and who has no thought of any other. But now let us suppose that he is told one day by his doctor that he is suffering from an incurable disease, and has only a few months to live. In these circumstances, would he not be bound to think of death as an enemy? Some one has said that 'to give up one's personality remains fundamentally an unacceptable proposition.' Yet it is precisely this 'unacceptable proposition' with which the man we are considering is inescapably confronted. Behind his doctor stands One from whose decision there is no appeal. He is in fact in the presence of a—to him—alien Authority, which seemingly cares nothing

for the havoc that his removal from earth will make of all his plans.

But now let us suppose something happens to convince this individual that, in spite of appearances, the alien Power is not as he thinks hostile to him after all. Suppose by some miracle he is made able to grasp the truth that, however unwelcome death's sudden summons is, it hides nevertheless a supremely loving purpose. Might not the effect be to alter his resistance to the Almighty's will into humble and trustful acceptance of it? In other words, might not his sinful will be so transformed into faith that even death will now be seen in a new context and revaluated accordingly? And that, surely, is the precise position which the Christian affirms has been brought about by the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ. By His patient endurance of the judgment of God upon sin, and by His steadfast testimony to the character of God as loving and good, Jesus has transformed the significance of death, and in so doing has destroyed its power to hurt us. Death has been shown to be but another of God's servants—one of His 'angels,' in fact. Just as the air-pilot who first broke through the sound-barrier demonstrated once for all the possibility of supersonic flight, so the resurrection of Jesus exhibited once for all His victory over sin and death, and demonstrated the reality of life beyond death. At one stroke the nature of death was altered from that of a barrier to that of a simple frontier between this world and the next, and henceforward, for the believer in Jesus Christ, death becomes, as it were, birth into a 'supermortal' existence. This is the change brought about by Christ's victory over sin—His 'abolition' of death.

Nowhere has this been more beautifully expressed than in Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress*. When Christiana received the message that the time had come for her to cross the River, the messenger gave her a token from the Master—'an arrow with a point sharpened with love, let easily into her heart.' So to the man who has been awakened to the Christian faith in God, death is but another step along the same road he has been travelling hitherto, that is, the road of trustful obedience to the Master whose love has replaced self as the motive power of life. The mystery and stress of dying still remain, and with it not only our human dread of the unknown, but that more solemn and searching awe which the soul must feel at the thought of the nearer presence of the Holy God. But death itself has been vanquished. It has been, by anticipation, 'swallowed up in victory.'

The conclusion must be that it is not by thinking about death but about God that we shall be best prepared to meet our end. In the words of John Donne: 'Our critical day is not the very day of our death but the whole course of our life.' The call of Christ to turn from sin to God comes to each one here and now. Let but that call be rightly answered in humble trust and obedience, and there is no one alive, whatever his past record, who may not know his sins forgiven, and learn to look even upon death in a new way so that, in the certainty of its abolition by Christ and in Christ, he may thankfully say with St. Francis: 'Be Thou praised, my Lord, of our Sister Bodily Death, from whom no man living may escape. Woe to those who die in mortal sin!'

---

FOURTH SUNDAY AFTER EASTER

## What is the Truth?

BY THE REVEREND DOUGLAS STEWART, M.A., LONDON

'Jesus saith unto him, I am . . . the truth.'—Jn $14^{6}$.

1. '"What is Truth?" said jesting Pilate; and would not stay for an answer.' So Francis Bacon begins his essay, *On Truth*. But was Pilate jesting? Is that the impression we gather from his examination of Christ? Is that what the Fourth Evangelist meant to convey by the story?

Pilate gives expression not to the levity of the classical world but to its despair. The claim of Christ appeared to him to be beyond belief, not because his world was young and light-hearted, but because it was, on the contrary, old and embittered. Another window into the first-century soul is provided by the same Evangelist in his description of Nicodemus. 'How can a man be born again when he is old?' And Nicodemus is speaking from within Judaism which had a source of hope unknown to the Gentile world.

To Pilate Jesus was simply another of those idealists who talk about 'bearing witness to the truth': another of those fanatics who imagine they have a panacea for the ills of humanity: another ignorant and simple man who in his naïveté thinks that an answer is possible to the riddle of existence. Pilate is the voice of civilization and experience rebuking the crude enthusiasm of a simpler culture.

If we might venture to put this into twentieth century terms, Pilate to-day would be a Frenchman. Looking out cynically upon the practical commonsense of the British, and upon the naïf idealism of the Americans, the French existentialist voices the deep hidden despair of modern times which is akin to the despair of the classical world. For although history cannot repeat itself, yet societies living far apart in time may sail through

similar spiritual weather, and there is a real sense in which we can understand the emotions of men in the first century.

The great surge of power and conquest was over for Rome—as for the modern West. They held an empire which was crumbling at the edges—as is ours. Their time of self-assurance and simplicity was gone. They were both enriched and ennervated by many philosophies and many religions. They were bewildered by a wealth of ideas which left them without any single or guiding ideal. The homogeneous world of the Republic was replaced by the heterogeneous and cosmopolitan Empire. They were physically great and spiritually hesitant.

The parallels are too obvious to need elaboration. Just consider one example. It would be a spiritual impossibility for us now to embark upon the conquest of India. The self-assurance of our eighteenth century or nineteenth century ancestors has gone for ever. We no longer believe that we should rule half the world for its own good.

And this uncertainty in action reflects a deeper and more fundamental uncertainty. Great discoveries have revolutionized our thinking but not in the sense of the seventeenth century expectation. As we approach the truth *the* truth retreats from us. The suspicion grows that while the scientific method can discover more and more of what is true, it is, by its nature, precluded from discovering the truth in any ultimate sense. Every scientific discovery answers one question and asks ten. The horizon retreats as we advance.

'What is truth?' we ask and the cloud which arises above our horizon is the thought that it is undiscoverable because non-existent.

In his book, *The Courage To Be*, Paul Tillich has outlined what he calls 'the ontological fears of man.' First comes the fear of death—simple, universal—and Tillich says that was the major fear of man up till the coming of Christ. Then comes the fear of guilt—conscience, judgment, hell which Tillich considers typical of the mediæval civilization. Finally, there arises the fear of meaninglessness—'What is truth?' 'There is no truth'—and this is modern man's distinctive spiritual enemy.

2. T. E. Lawrence conveyed the same idea differently when he spoke of doubt as 'our modern crown of thorns,' so it is not without significance that in the Fourth Gospel it is Thomas who elicits from Christ this word 'I am the truth.' And it is the distinctive Christian answer to both the classical and the modern world. Distinctive and unique because elsewhere the truth is always sought for or presented as an abstraction of the mind, a mathematical formula, a scientific 'law,' a right principle. Only in Christ are 'the truth' and personality united.

All other religions and philosophies have this in common that they assume that the truth must be some kind of formula—a phantom of the brain—which will cover the whole of reality and satisfy the mind of man. But what slips through that net is the philosopher who thinks, the saint who meditates, and the scientist who labours. Inevitably they discover truth and miss *the* truth. For *the* truth must contain the philosopher, the saint and the scientist. And the cynicism and despair which beset us are rooted in our experience of solving our physical, but not our personal, problems. Man is solving the problems of the universe but not the problem of men. Man is creating the H-bomb, but not the humanity capable of controlling this knowledge.

'I am . . . the truth.' Here is the unique Christian solution different in kind from every other. The truth is a man. We will never wring the ultimate truth from the universe because the universe was created for something beyond itself. By itself it is without meaning, and they are right who, studying it in isolation from man, say so. The universe will not yield us some ultimate vision of reality because it is not an end in itself. The universe is made for man and not man for the universe.

'I am a reed, but a thinking reed,' said Pascal. The human mind transcends the immensities of space and time because it stands nearer to reality. Truth must be consonance with reality and the thinker is more real than the thought, the saint more real than the action, and the scientist more real than his discovery.

We fear this logical necessity because men seem more hopeless than the impersonal. In seventeenth-century England they turned in despair from the religious and political strife of parties to the neutrality and peace of science. The Royal Society seemed like a haven from Catholic-Protestant, Parliament-Royalist strife. Man is more relative than the atom. How can *the* truth be in him?

'I am . . . the truth.' It is not the relativity of physics over against the relativity of psychology. The universe was made for man and man was made for Christ. This is the daring assertion of the Fourth Gospel. *The* truth is Christ. What we see in the universe is the groaning and travailing of creation to bring forth a spiritual being, man. What we see in humanity is a groaning and travailing to bring forth Christ. The universe cannot be explained physically because that omits the explainer. Man cannot be explained without transcendent reference, without Christ.

Put it now in more theological terms. Truth is consonance with reality. But reality is simply God. Therefore we approach *the* truth as we

approach to God. There is truth in the whole creation because it is a creation. 'Consider the lilies of the field . . . the birds of the air.' But in man there is something more, the Divine image, the inbreathed spirit. And the whole human story is an unfolding of Divine purpose. 'He made known his ways unto Moses, his acts unto the children of Israel.'

How much of God is in Christ? That becomes the ultimate question. 'In him dwelleth all the fullness of the Godhead bodily' is St. Paul's answer. 'He that hath seen me hath seen the Father' is St. John's.

That which stands between mankind and despair is simply Christ. The manifestation of the heart and meaning of all things. 'I am . . . the truth.'

# Recent Foreign Theology

**The Arabs in Syria before Muhammad.** The distinguished French scholar René Dussaud has written a large work devoted to the study of the penetration of the Arabs into Syria before the rise of Islam.[1] He deals with the Nabataeans and Palmyrenes, with the South Arabians, and then with the Israelites, Aramaeans and Canaanites. In the last chapter he rapidly surveys a number of problems of interest to the Old Testament student. The Exodus from Egypt is placed in the region of 1450 B.C., and I am credited with being an advocate of this view. The reader of my Schweich Lectures, *From Joseph to Joshua*, will be as surprised as I am at this. Recent archaeological evidence from a number of sites, bearing on the problem of the relations between the Hebrews and the Ḥabiru or Ḥapiru, and other Biblical problems, is cited, and in particular Ras Shamra evidence relevant to the study of Biblical history and institutions is adduced. While there is no prospect of the agreement of scholars on a number of these problems, every reader will learn much from this study, and many will be stimulated by the abundant references to literature to pursue some of them further.

---

**Strack-Billerbeck Rabbinical Index.** The New Testament Commentary of Strack-Billerbeck, with its abundant citation of Talmudic and Midrashic passages in illustration of the New Testament, has long been an indispensable tool for Biblical study. After the War it was out of print for a time, until it was reprinted. Now an additional index volume has been prepared by K. Adolph, under the editorship of Joachim Jeremias,[2] giving the references to all the passages in the Talmud, Midrashim, and other rabbinical sources, cited in the Commentary. References to the Pseudepigrapha, Targums and Jewish writers, such as Josephus and Philo, are also included. A good index increases the value of any book, and this addition to the Subject and Biblical indexes already given in vol. 4 will be welcomed by all users of the work.

---

**Prophet and Cult in Israel.** A doctoral dissertation by K. Roubos, submitted to the University of Utrecht, and written in Dutch but with an English summary, is devoted to the subject of Prophecy and Cult in Israel.[3] As is well known, there has been in recent years a softening of the lines formerly drawn between prophet and priest, and a claim that there were cultic prophets with a defined place in the ritual of worship. Dr. Roubos reacts against this in a rather extreme way. He argues that Amos, Hosea, First Isaiah, Micah and Jeremiah were not cultic prophets, and that the passages denouncing sacrifice in the books which bear the names of these prophets were not an absolute condemnation of the cultus under all circumstances. In this I think he is quite right. Where he lets his reaction carry him too far is in his repudiation of cultic prophets altogether, and in the sharp line he draws between the *nebî'îm* and what he calls the Scriptural prophets. He recognizes that the same title was given to the two groups, but does not adequately recognize the many varieties of persons who bear this title. He therefore falls into the error of over-simplification with which he charges others. The difference between the small minority of the prophets whose memory we still honour and the forgotten, and often nameless, majority is not one of status, but of stature.

---

**Universalism in the Psalms.** A dissertation in Afrikaans, submitted to the Free University of Amsterdam, is by P. J. Smal, and deals with Universalism in the Psalms.[4] The method of the author is to take the psalms which he finds relevant for his purpose, and to examine them one by one, in the order in which they stand in the Bible. About one third of the psalms are thus studied,

[1] *La Pénétration des Arabes en Syrie avant l'Islam* [1955]. Geuthner, Paris; Fr. 3,000.

[2] *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*, vol. 5: *Rabbinischer Index* [1956]. Beck, Munich; DM 15; bound DM 18.

[3] *Profetie en Cultus in Israël* [1956]. Veenman en Zonen, Wageningen.

[4] *Die universalisme in die Psalms* [1956]. Kok, Kampen.

ome quite briefly and others at considerable ength. The author finds in many of the psalms tudied a particularism which rests on God's ovenant with His people, and the universalism xpressed in the Psalter is to be seen in relation to his. There is a general universalism, which consts in the recognition of God as the Creator and ustainer of the world, and as its final Ruler and udge, or which is to be found in its monotheism nd transcendentalism. But beyond this there is hat the author calls the 'universalism in a regnant sense,' which is found in the passages hich call on the nations to praise and acknowdge God, or in which the people of God are called to make Him known to all peoples.

---

**The Ancient Near East.** Few writers are more rolific than Professor Sabatino Moscati, and he rites books almost as fast as others can read hem. His latest work consists of a series of radio alks, dealing successively with the peoples of the ancient Near East.[1] While they are intended for a wide public, they are the work of an able scholar, and each chapter is followed by a careful documentation. The three main divisions of the book bear the curious titles: 'The Elements,' 'The Catalysts,' and 'The Synthesis.' The first treats of the Sumerians, the Babylonians and Assyrians, and the Egyptians; the second with the Hittites and Hurrians, the Canaanites and Aramaeans, and the Israelites; and the third with the Persians. It will be observed that the Philistines are left out of account. Despite this strange omission, the book will be found to be of real value for the succinct account of the historical, religious, literary and cultural significance of the peoples included.

H. H. Rowley

*Manchester*

[1] *Il profilo dell'Oriente Mediterranea: Panorami di Civiltà preclassiche* [1956]. Edizioni Radio Italiana, Turin.

# Contributions and Comments

## The Biblical Conception of 'Faith'

May I be allowed respectfully to remind Professor Moule that my article on which he has commented (The Expository Times, lxviii. [February 1957] 157) was about *only one aspect* of the Biblical conception of faith, and that I explicitly confined myself to that (lxviii. [January 1957] 111–112)?

My contention is that in most of the passages I cited 'the faith of Jesus Christ' does not refer simply to the faithfulness of Christ or simply to the answering faithfulness of man but is essentially a polarized expression. In the polar relationship of faith I cannot say that man's part is the principal one, though it is absolutely essential. Thus in Gal 2[20] the understanding of 'the faith of the Son of God' cannot properly be abstracted from the 'I yet not I, but Christ' which immediately precedes it. There are some passages where Paul uses an expression such as 'the faith of Christ' pregnantly and in which, it seems to me, the faithfulness of Christ is included as the main ingredient, but by no means to the reducing of our faith in Him, or of the necessary reference to faith.

The arguments adduced by Professor Moule do not seem relevant to the suggestion I advanced—they might have some point against a claim that every use of πίστις in the New Testament is to be interpreted along this line, which I do not for a moment hold. Strangely, the single instance in which Professor Moule seems to concede this interpretation is not one that I myself would allow (Heb 12[2]). Of course, πίστις often means the believer's faith, and the verb πιστεύειν is sometimes used unmistakably with Christ as object.

It is not enough, however, to interpret Paul's language merely out of the rules of Greek grammar, without careful and exact reference to his Hebraic background and thought. I was, therefore, attempting to study one aspect of πίστις along the line suggested by Hoskyns and Davey, with their treatment of ἀλήθεια in mind (*The Riddle of the New Testament*, 35–44). Could my suggestion about the meaning of πίστει ἀληθείας in 2 Th 2[13] astound any one but one tempted to forget that Paul was a Hebrew of the Hebrews?

The real objection of Professor Moule comes out in his fourth point: his apparent failure to see that far from reducing man's act in response to God's approach, the faithfulness of God in Christ actually establishes man in a position in which he is really free to respond in the fullness of faith. Does the fact that Christ has wrought a finished work on our behalf mean that our response is seriously reduced? Surely the very opposite is the case!

May I also suggest that Professor Moule has mistaken the essential point of my article? I was not saying that our response 'to the gospel is the work of God's grace in us,' but that our response of faith is grounded upon the faithfulness of God

in Christ, and that our faith in Him has to take into account the saving significance of His historical humanity; including His human obedience and faith.

T. F. TORRANCE

*Edinburgh*

PROFESSOR Torrance has courteously allowed me a 'preview' of his reply to my letter (February number [lxviii. 157]), and we have had a friendly correspondence and, I believe, understand one another's positions; but perhaps I may be allowed some comments in print.

1. I had not overlooked the fact that Professor Torrance, dealing as he did in his article with only one aspect of faith, recognised that there were other aspects. My quarrel was only with his own explicit statement that *πίστις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ* (though a 'polarized' expression including more ideas than one) denotes 'the faithfulness of Christ *as its main ingredient*' (my italics).

2. In the fourth point of my letter, where Professor Torrance says my real objection lies, I was of course not contending that the faithfulness of Christ reduces our faith in Him; only that to reduce emphasis upon our faith in Him reduces—emphasis upon our faith! It is not the *fact* of the necessary existence of the two together that I was questioning; only the elimination of primary reference to our faith in the passages in question.

3. My other three points were none of them concerned with the 'rules' of Greek grammar, only with the actual usage of St. Paul: that (1) he does demonstrably use the genitive loosely (as we all know, he was not famous for keeping the 'rules'); (2) he does use the verb in the way in which I was arguing that the noun is used; (3) the noun without the genitive clearly means the believer's faith, in certain passages which I adduced.

I should like to repeat, with regard to (2), that I still believe the *onus probandi* to lie upon anyone who interprets *πίστις* differently from *πιστεύειν* in a passage such as Gal $2^{16}$:

*εἰδότες δὲ ὅτι οὐ δικαιοῦται ἄνθρωπος ἐξ ἔργων νόμου, ἐὰν μὴ διὰ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ ἡμεῖς εἰς Χριστὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐπιστεύσαμεν, ἵνα δικαιωθῶμεν ἐκ πίστεως Χριστοῦ.*

4. As for He $12^{2}$, while by no means convinced that Westcott was right, I think there is more to be said for his suggestion there than in some of Professor Torrance's Pauline instances.

5. But perhaps the most constructive contribution I can make to this correspondence is to remind readers of J. B. Lightfoot's note on the words denoting Faith, in his commentary on Galatians. It cannot, I think, be said of that it lacks exact reference to St. Paul's Hebraic background and thought.

C. F. D. MOULE

*Cambridge*

## The Typological Hypothesis

IN the very interesting article by Dr. Farrer in the May, 1956 number of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES [lxvii. 228] on 'Typology,' he begins and ends by saying that there never was such a thing as the typological hypothesis. In his first paragraph, however, he looked for the 'hypothesis' in the wrong place. The 'typological hypothesis' is surely the hypothesis that typology gives us meaningful interpretation. Perhaps 'hypothesis' is not the best word to use: 'typological assumption' might be better. For it has been taken for granted by Biblical writers and by preachers through the centuries that typology is meaningful. Modern scientific method has led many to question this, and it may well be asked whether 'typology' is not a method that belongs to the realm of myth, and the relations between persons or events of different times are only to be understood by historical analysis that traces causes and effects. If, therefore, they cannot be so understood, then there is no other valid or meaningful relation at all. Typological relations will have to be discarded in the process of 'demythologizing.'

That Biblical writers used typology is a 'plain truth,' as Dr. Farrer says. But did their use of typology enable them to understand their facts better, or did it lead them to distort them? I meet a person with, say, the name of Allen. I had previously known another person of that name, whom I particularly liked or disliked. Quite unconsciously that like or dislike is carried over to this new person, and I interpret his actions more favourably or unfavourably than they in their own right deserve. Verbal associations and other association (the 'halo effect' and the like) are common enough. Is the typology that Dr. Farrer sees in Mark's treatment of the two incidents concerning the Sabbath nothing more than so superficial a verbal association? Or is it of the order of profound spiritual insight which scientific eye hath not seen?

If a person describes an improbable incident, we may at first disbelieve him, but if he gives a scientific explanation that links up this incident with what is known of how things happen in this world, we may be satisfied that it is coherent with a rational world. But it is possible that to make it so coherent our informant has all unconsciously altered details of the incident (much

s a person narrating his dream tends to make oherent what was hopelessly bizarre). The earer is satisfied if the account sounds rational, e does not question the details. Later, if closer quiry is called for, it may be found that details ad been overlooked or altered to fit the scientific heory. Sometimes the very neatness of the tting makes one suspicious—it is too good to be ue. None the less in general we consider that cidents properly reported must be coherent ithin a system of relationships of a causal attern, even if the key to the pattern in any articular case eludes us.

So with regard to typology—is it a genuine attern of relationships equally valid with the attern of causal relationships, even if in particular stances there is some forcing and altering of etails : or, is it a completely wrong method of terpretation, outmoded in a scientific world, nd therefore due to be ' demythologized ' ? The rguments of the writer to the Hebrews had weight ith readers who shared the ' typological hypo- hesis.' But can these arguments have any eight with us ? We may still hold that Christ the final Word of God, but are the arguments n ' Hebrews ' so much waste of breath, simply retty and interesting parallels, of archaeological interest only to a student of New Testament literature, and do they merely illustrate in old-fashioned ways truth that is established on entirely other grounds ?

This question is radical, but it is the question that lurks in the minds of many with regard to typology. That typology gives valid grounds for acceptance of dogma just as a causal explanation gives valid grounds for accepting the report of an otherwise extraordinary incident is the ' typological hypothesis.' This is not primarily an exegetical matter, but an epistemological issue. It is also unlike the other hypotheses dealt with in the series in The Expository Times in that these were new hypotheses put forward in contrast to long accepted assumptions, whereas this is the old assumption, recently called in question, but now re-asserted by Dr. Farrer and others. I am grateful for Dr. Farrer's very interesting and penetrating article on the exegetical aspects of typology : but I hope that he may take up the epistemological problem and reconsider the hypothesis that lies at the very base of the aim and validity of typology.

E. L. Wenger

*Serampore College,*
*India*

# Entre Nous

## eing and Believing

The Apostles' Creed, the Lord's Prayer, the ermon on the Mount, the Ten Commandments—ere is a wealth of truth whose breadth and length nd depth and height have never yet been fully easured by all the books in all the theological braries of the world. Every minister sets himself t some time to expound these mighty themes to is people. Millions of words have been written pon them. After long centuries of constant use, ey still give form to our worship and nourishment o our souls. They are the banner of the ecumen- al community. All varieties of the faith, all anging emphases of passing generations, all ovements of that great unfinished symphony hich is the story of the Church, find in them their cus and their inspiration. There are deeps in em beyond the power of the best Christian philo- phy to fathom, and simplicities understandable y a child. Here, indeed, is God's plenty : here re the unsearchable riches of Christ.

What Canon Bryan Green in his exposition—*eing and Believing* [1]—has attempted is nothing less than to bring the Creed, the Prayer, the Sermon, the Commandments within the scope of one short book. A daring endeavour ! What could usefully be said on these tremendous themes within so brief a compass ? Is it not bound to be superficial ? If any one feels inclined to press these questions, let him read the book. There are here a sureness of touch, a keen eye for essentials, a freshness of phrase, an awareness of the contemporary scene in which the Church and Christian people have to live their life and play their part, which are admirable and arresting. Canon Green's earlier book—' The Practice of Evangelism '—was a notable contribution to the strategy of Christian mission ; and those who have seen at first-hand his work in the Oxford Pastorate, in Brompton, and now in the great Parish Church of Birmingham, recognize in him that union of Biblical theology and social concern, of directness and humour and passion, which alone can keep evangelism strong and stable and healthy. For all its brevity the present book will help many to a clearer understanding of the nexus between Christian conduct and Christian faith, between action on the so-called secular level and life hidden with Christ in God,

[1] Hodder and Stoughton ; 4s. 6d. net.

between *being* and *believing*. As meditations for the devotional hour these short studies on great subjects are warmly to be commended.

JAMES S. STEWART

---

### The Whites of the Lord

Every now and again one comes across one of these rare books which demonstrate that the days of the Acts of the Christian Apostles are not yet past. Such a book is *Missionary Diary*, by Ruth Siegfried.[1] Major Ruth Siegfried tells in it the story of the work she has done in Salvation Army Schools in Belgian Congo and French Equatorial Africa.

If there is one essential quality for a missionary that quality is love, and Major Siegfried has love. Very early in her diary she writes : ' I am told that it takes about six months to learn enough Lingala to hold a conversation. I have learned to say " Nalingi yo "—" I love you." ' Major Siegfried herself comes from Germany, but she writes—' One year ago I received Marching Orders for the Congo, a new " homeland." Of course Wolfskirch will remain for ever my real homeland, but if you have to wander about the world, you call " homeland " the place where you can give your heart away.' That is just what Major Siegfried so gloriously has done. ' Here in Africa,' she writes, ' everything moves slowly—except the beats of my heart.' ' Oh, these Congo children, the hearts of these Congo children ! They are the loveliest thing the Congo has to offer . . . and the more they worry me the more I love them.'

Love must issue in trust, and to the African trust is very important, and it can be seen in the smallest things. ' Monitor Paul said to me : " Close your eyes and open your mouth." I obeyed, and he put a roasted pea-nut into my mouth. " Now I know you love me," he said. It was more than a game to him. Had I not obeyed he would have been deeply grieved, saying to himself : " The white people have no confidence in us." '

The spirit of love certainly does not kill a sense of humour. When Major Siegfried was leaving for furlough at the end of a school term, one of the old boys of the school prayed : ' Dear Lord, bless our Captain. She is the hundredth sheep. She goes away and leaves us ninety and nine alone.' ' Now,' says Major Siegfried, ' I know what I am.'

The African is amazingly generous. ' They share everything they have. When a child arrives at school with a *kwanga* (a kind of porridge), a banana or a fish, he shares his food with half a dozen others ; indeed, sometimes he gives it all away and goes hungry himself. If I give something to one of the monitors, he calls the others and shares it. A girl comes to the meeting with a tin of milk ; before long every one has had a drink! ' There are graces which uncivilization may entirely lack, but there are graces which civilization seems entirely to take away.

Major Siegfried tells us that in her part of Africa the Roman Catholics are called *Mon Pé*—the African rendering of ' *Mon Père*,' the title given to priests. All Protestant missionaries, whatever their nationality, are called *Na Anglaises*—the English, but the Salvation Army is called *Mondele Na Njambe*—' the Whites of the Lord.' And when we read her story we know why.

Early in her diary Major Siegfried writes : ' Tomorrow I am thirty years of age, and I am satisfied.' A book like this is the living witness that it is he who seeks to save his life who will lose it, and he who recklessly gives it away who will find it.

WILLIAM BARCLAY

---

### Leading

' I have a vivid memory of a day when, as children, we were playing together at the side of a London canal. Our rubber ball went in, and bobbed about tantalizingly near the bank. Small David was urged to reach for it. Obediently I crouched perilously on my haunches and stretched for all I was worth—and just touched it. " Go on," hissed my elder sister fervently, " you're there ! " And I was, for as she spoke she gave me an encouraging push, and the next moment I had my first experience of total immersion !

' There are many parents just like my sister. They are ready with encouraging cries and stimulating pushes, but *they do not go in front*. " Go on ! " they cry—but from behind. They want their children to study hard, to excel in exams ; but they themselves sink contentedly behind the *Mirror* or the *Express*. They are all in favour of discipline, but only—of course—until one grows up. Good manners and good taste are essential ; but at the end of a busy day parents are surely exempt from these refinements. . . . They are enthusiastic about any interest in Sunday school and Church, for they want " the best " for their children ; but they are strangely self-denying, and do not prescribe these things for themselves. So always there is a helpful push, but not a leading of the way.' [2]

[1] Salvationist Publishing and Supplies ; 8s. net.

[2] David N. Francis, *But Above All*, 66 f.

---

Printed in Scotland by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.